Roman Epic

An Interpretative Introduction

M. Von Albrecht

BRILL

ROMAN EPIC

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

J.M. BREMER · L.F. JANSSEN · H. PINKSTER

H.W. PLEKET · C.J. RUIJGH · P.H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C.J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM CENTESIMUM OCTOGESIMUM NONUM

MICHAEL VON ALBRECHT

ROMAN EPIC

ROMAN EPIC

AN INTERPRETATIVE INTRODUCTION

BY

MICHAEL VON ALBRECHT

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
1999

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Albrecht, Michael von.
Roman epic : an interpretative introduction / by Michael von Albrecht.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958 ; v. 189)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 9004112928 (cloth)
1. Epic poetry, Latin—History and criticism. 2. History, Ancient, in literature. 3. Literature and history—Rome. 4. Rome—In literature. 5. Rhetoric, Ancient. I. Title. II. Series.
PA6054.A4 1998
873'.0109—dc21 98-49755
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

[Mnemosyne / Supplementum]
Mnemosyne : bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill
Früher Schriftenreihe
Teilw. u.d.T.: Mnemosyne / Supplements
Reihe Supplementum zu: Mnemosyne
189. Albrecht, Michael von: Roman epic. – 1999

Albrecht, Michael von:
Roman epic : an interpretative introduction / by Michael von Albrecht. – Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 1999
(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 189)
ISBN 90-04-11292-8

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 11292 8

© Copyright 1999 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface vii

I. Introduction: Intertextuality and Rhetoric. *Roman Epic Poets and Their Readers* 1

II. Livius Andronicus: Inuentio. *The Rediscovery of the* Odyssey *and the Invention of a Poetic Language*..................... 33

III. Naevius: Dispositio. *The Clash of Myth and History*............. 45

IV. Ennius: Elocutio. *A Horse Simile or A Clash of Two Cultures. A Hellenistic Poet in an Archaic Society*..................... 63

V. Virgil:

1. Prooemium. *The Poet and His Reader. The* Iliad *and the* Odyssey *as Subtexts to the Proem of the* Aeneid....... 75
2. Narratio. *Aeneas' Account of his Flight*.......................... 90
3. Inuentio I. *Virgil's View of History in the Catalogue of Heroes* (Aen. *6. 679-899*) 99
4. Inuentio II. *Turnus, a Tragic Hero? Virgil and Aristotle*.. 120
5. Dispositio. Double Inversion and the Rhetoric of Silence 123
6. Elocutio I. *Virgil's Similes and the Genesis of the* Aeneid 129
7. Elocutio II. *On the Use of Tenses in the* Aeneid 134

VI. Ovid:

1. Inuentio. *Ovid and His Readers* 143
2. Prooemium. *Ovid's Arachne and Human Creativity*..... 153
3. Elocutio. *Similes in Ovid's* Metamorphoses *and Their Functions* 166
4. Clash of Genres. *Gods and Religion in Ovid's* Metamorphoses *with Special Regard to Venus and Elegy*....... 177
5. Clash of Systems of Values. *The Daughters of Anius*.... 197

VII. Albinovanus Pedo: Elocutio and Defamiliarization. *The Thrill of a First Experience*.. 209

VIII. Cornelius Severus: Death and Poetic Survival of Oratory 217

IX. Lucan: The Revival of Epic through Science and Rhetoric.. 227

X. Valerius Flaccus: Elocutio. *The Myth of Io or the Magic of the Present Participle* 251
XI. Statius: The Futility of Rhetoric. *Achilles under the Spell of Beauty* (Achilleid *1. 242-396*) 277
XII. Silius Italicus:
1. Intertextuality as Guiding Principle of Invention 291
2. From Elegy to Epic. *Claudia Quinta: Beauty under False Suspicion* 301
XIII. Claudian: Poetic Rhetoric and Intertextuality. *Proserpina's Tapestry* 317
XIV. Corippus: Transformation of Epic Imagery 329

Bibliography 341
List of Abbreviations: Periodicals and Standard Works 361
Index 365

PREFACE

The present book is meant to be an interpretative introduction to Roman epic. Although it is based on over thirty years of research and academic teaching, it is addressed not only to students and teachers, but also to all friends of literature. If a reader feels encouraged to come back to one of the great poets or to discover some writer he has not yet known, he might be surprised to see that Roman epic is a genre much less rigid, sclerotic, or obsolete than expected. Its history reflects a constant search for identity and a permanent discovery of ever new identities.

The development of Roman epic is paradoxical and unpredictable from the outset. It was not born from an organic indigenous tradition, but deliberately created by a foreign schoolmaster. In need of a Latin textbook for his pupils, Livius Andronicus had to meddle with all kinds of intercultural, intertextual, and interlingual problems before he found some interesting solutions that proved helpful for later generations. Likewise, Naevius, Ennius and their successors struggled with contradictory cultural codes: consider the clash between the archaic structures of Roman society and the modernism of Hellenistic literature; between an author's adherence to his provincial birthplace and to a larger, "Roman" identity; between Greek myth and Roman history; between mythological beliefs and philosophical enlightenment; between the poetic traditions of epic and the modern techniques of rhetoric. All this conspired to confront the Roman epic poets with ever new problems and to keep the genre of Roman epic alive. In this context (giving rise to various phenomena of "intertextuality" in the wide sense of the word) it is intriguing to observe the great amount of creativity, inventiveness, and ingenuity deployed by each single poet to find his own "truth".

Following the vicissitudes of a literary genre such as epic through almost eight centuries, we become aware of continuous change and renewal, crossings and inclusions of different texts and literary genres, poetic and rhetorical techniques, cultural and educational codes. The authors often react in quite unexpected ways to the challenges resulting from their specific historical situation or social and intellectual background. It was unforeseeable that Virgil should oppose an "epic on the birth of Rome" to Homer's *Iliad*, which is overshadowed

by the idea of Troy's imminent destruction. Nor could any sober observer expect the rise of a mythical epic like the *Aeneid* in a post-philosophical age, let alone its universal acceptance. No less daring—and much more shocking indeed—was Lucan's renewal of the genre through science and rhetoric. Surprisingly enough, it was rhetoric again that contributed to generate that startling vividness of description (even of things unseen, such as allegories) found in Ovid, Statius, and Claudian.

Our approach to Roman epic is interpretative; the reader is invited to study individual texts and draw conclusions from his observations, not to expect exhaustive textbook information (for which he might consult, for instance, our *History of Latin Literature*).[1] As for the range of authors discussed, after the three early pioneers of the genre, Virgil is paid the special attention he deserves; but there are also less known names such as Albinovanus Pedo or Cornelius Severus—precious as "missing links" between the Augustan age and the First Century A.D. Along with his more famous colleagues—Lucan, Valerius Flaccus and Statius —Silius Italicus, who up to now has profited comparatively little from the recent "boom" of Silver Latin studies, is given some space, as is Claudian, whose exceptional talent should no longer be obscured by modern prejudices against "late" epochs. Finally, Corippus gives an interesting Christian reinterpretation of the Roman empire and of the imagery of Roman epic.[2]

Of the categories that help us to elucidate both the traditional and the innovative elements in in the texts under consideration, two may be mentioned here: rhetoric and intertextuality. The literal and metaphorical meanings of these terms are explained in the introduction. In contrast to Benedetto Croce, who considered rhetoric detrimental to poetry, our approach allows us to give perhaps a more equitable account of its importance to Latin epic. It is true that many poetic texts—especially some speeches found in our chapters on Statius, Claudian, and even Virgil—attest to the uselessness and futility of rhetoric as a means of persuasion (a sad everyday experience during the imperial period). The waning influence of oratory

---

[1] 2 vols. (Leiden 1997); for further information, cf. also the Bibliography given at the end of the present book.

[2] We limit ourselves here to "Roman" epic: the intriguing domain of Biblical epic is outside the scope of the present book. Moreover, the most important achievements in this genre were written much later than the period under consideration here; a treatment within the chronological framework of antiquity would prove unsatisfactory.

on public life, however, was compensated for by the creative impact of rhetoric on poetry. In a language adverse to neologism, the arrangement and combination of words gains in importance. Hence, with educated writers, rhetoric becomes part and parcel of their language. In this context, a poet imbued with rhetoric such as Ovid proves to be a touchstone. In several chapters of this book, therefore, Ovidian passages are used to pinpoint, by way of parallel or contrast, the literary aims of later authors and to show that, in some crucial aspects, rhetoric did not hamper poetic invention but lent wings to it. In poetry, of course, rhetorical devices are only tools subservient to specifically poetic goals; or, to give the same idea a positive turn, these techniques, once liberated from the necessity of satisfying practical needs, gain new qualities defying any *mechanical* application of rhetorical terms to poetic texts.

As for intertextuality (in the narrower sense of the word), in most of our chapters a definite text serves as a starting point, and the specific intention of its author is illustrated by comparing it to other texts. One of our points is that any reference made to other texts is not an aim in itself but part of the "language" used by the author to communicate with his readers. Sometimes, however, intertextuality extends to the structure and meaning of entire books or works. In some of our chapters, therefore, a general theme (e.g. the relationship between author and reader) is illustrated by a systematic discussion of thematically related passages from various contexts, or a less known author's work is presented to the reader at some length, as happens with Naevius (to evince his "modern" approach to intertextuality in the domain of structure) and Silius Italicus (who deserves our attention for his systematic use of intertextuality as a principle of invention).

At the end of each chapter, an epilogue recapitulates what is relevant to the themes of intertextuality and rhetoric. But the author is far from considering these terms magic formulas; they are no more than tools. Since both of these techniques are considered integral parts of each poet's language and since some chapters are devoted to the poetic function of linguistic phenomena like tenses or participles, a careful reader will notice that behind the multiple approaches adopted in the present book there is a sustained interest in combining literary and linguistic interpretation into what might be named a "textual syntax".[1] However, it would be premature to call the present

[1] This is A.Scherer's term: A.Scherer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Syntax* (Heidelberg, 1975): 101-102; 104-111.

book "a textual syntax of epic" or "a poetics of epic" rather than a series of interpretative contributions to these ambitious programmes.

On his journey through the epochs of Roman epic the author was accompanied by attentive and helpful audiences and readers in many countries. Although individual parts were originally written at different periods, the book was planned as a unit, and all of the chapters were repeatedly recast to make the basic ideas more prominent and to render the text as readable as possible. A first draft of the whole was written down during a course on Roman Epic given at the University of Florida, Gainesville. At various stages of the work, the English style of the book was kindly improved by Allan Kershaw, Raymond Marks, Claudia Nissle, and Francis R.Schwartz. My brilliant young colleague, Gregor Damschen, kindly read the proofs and compiled the index.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Intertextuality and Rhetoric[1]
Roman Epic Poets and Their Readers

Nature of the Public Addressed

Although at first glance the study of Latin epic poets and their readers might seem relatively uncomplicated, it is in fact multifaceted and problematic. Whenever one inquires into the nature of the public addressed, its influence on the author's work, the forms of contact between author and reader or the influence of the author on his readers, one will encounter more than one answer, each reflecting the time, place, author, and work in question.

First of all, we should resist the temptation to conceive of the average educated reader of today as being similar to his ancient counterpart; for the large-scale proliferation and general accessibility of books is no less recent a phenomenon than the invention of printing. This is equally true of common literacy.[2] In antiquity there were considerable discrepancies in literacy between early and later times, urban and rural areas, men and women, the nobility and the poorer classes; indeed, even some slaves were more educated than their masters, especially in earlier times. There was no neat borderline, in terms of either space or time, between these conflicting "layers" or "categories", and it is impossible to draw a consistent picture of "the" Roman public. In early Rome, the situation was all

---

[1] A.J.Boyle, *Roman Epic* (London, New York, 1993); E.Burck, *Das römische Epos* (Darmstadt, 1979); F.Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (NewYork, Melbourne, 1989); G.B.Conte, *Virgilio. Il genere e i suoi confini* (Milano, 1984); D.C.Feeney, *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* (Oxford, 1991); J.B.Hainsworth, *The Idea of Epic* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford, 1991); N.Horsfall (and others), *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995); T.J.Sienkiewicz, *The Classical Epic. An Annotated Bibliography* (Pasadena, California, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1991); H.L.C.Tristram (ed.), *New Methods in the Research of Epic* (Tübingen, 1998 = *ScriptOralia* 107).

[2] E.J.Kenney, "Books and Readers in the Roman World", in: *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, II: Latin Literature* (Cambridge, 1982): 10 "no quantitative estimate of the extent of literacy at any period in the Roman world is possible".

the more complicated as a relatively archaic society produced its own literature under the influence of Hellenistic literature, which reflected a civilization in its "late" and "modern" stage.

As a rule, in antiquity books were meant to be read aloud; silent reading was an exception, as it is even today with sheet music. Books were published by dictating the text to a group of slaves. Publication was itself preceded by private readings among friends who were invited to criticize the text, and such *recitationes*, which in the first century B.C. became a regular feature of the literary life of Rome, were also a form of advertisement. This practice influenced the form of the texts, which were deliberately written to impress their audience. A corollary to this was the increasing impact of rhetoric on Latin poetry. Given the importance of acoustic performance, intertextual relationships which strike the ear (such as play on words and sounds,[1] direct quotations) were noticed more easily by the listeners than more abstract types of intertextuality (such as inversional relationships between scenes).

Originally, heroic poetry had been intended for a largely illiterate public. This is equally true for the aristocratic audience which gave rise to the Homeric poems and for the rural public of Slavic bards. In the Classical and Hellenistic periods the situation changed radically. Apollonius of Rhodes would address himself to a learned and sophisticated readership. Although one might have expected a return to more "archaic" conditions at the dawn of Roman literature, surprisingly enough, the early Roman epic poets were not primitive bards, but *poetae docti* in the Hellenistic vein. Rather than posing as prophets, these intellectuals assumed the role of schoolmasters. From Ennius onward, they were proud of being clients, if not friends, of powerful Roman senators, who, having become the masters of the civilized world, increasingly felt obliged to maintain a certain cultural and intellectual standard. Given the Roman zeal for teaching and learning, the use of private teachers was a wide-spread phenomenon in the noble families. Quite naturally, teachers were most frequently slaves, freedmen, or clients of Greek origin, and it is no wonder, therefore, that Greek grammar and rhetoric were often more firmly established in the curriculum than their Latin counterparts. To satisfy the national pride of their patrons, the earliest client poets and private teachers busied themselves with creating a Latin literature.

---

[1] E.g., *O Tite tute Tati tibi tanta tyranne tulisti* (Ennius, *Ann.* 104 Sk.) or *At tuba terribili sonitu taratantara dixit* (Ennius, *Ann.* 451 Sk.).

Their initial choice of the Saturnian metre may reflect some forgotten Roman convivial traditions. However, the normal venue where Roman epic was read was either the classroom or the *atrium* of the noble patron praised by his client. Since girls in ancient Rome were not totally excluded from instruction and ladies participated in the symposia, there was also a female audience, not necessarily less competent in matters of literature than their fathers or husbands.[1] From the very beginning, Roman epic poets had to be aware of different layers within their audience, adult men and women, students, and pupils. Last but not least, there might have been some judicious fellow-client or some learned slave (whose judgement was possibly more important to the author than that of many others). This constellation conditioned the invention of texts which from the outset were constructed to be read on different levels of meaning. Latin epic is multi-dimensional by definition.

Influence of the Public on Literature

The very conditions of the rise of Latin epic shaped both its form and content. Once Italy had been unified, there was a public prepared to read the *Odyssey* in Latin as a part of their ancestral history (actually, many scenes of the *Odyssey* are set in Italy) and as a part of their new Italian identity. Rather than a mere translation, Livius Andronicus' work was an application of the Ulysses theme to a new social and political context and its transference into a different linguistic medium.

The father of Latin literature, Livius Andronicus, was an educated Greek who came to Rome as a slave after the fall of Tarentum. In the family of his patron, with whom he remained connected as a client after his manumission, he performed the duties of tutor and educator to his master's sons. Very probably the first Latin epic, the *Odusia*, was written as a textbook for this purpose. Quite in contrast to the small size of its original audience, this book became a reader for generations of Roman pupils. Horace himself would recall the epic as one of his first impressions in Latin literature, a memory inextricably linked to the blows of Orbilius the schoolmaster, who became

[1] Ovid (*Ars* 3. 329-348) proposed an impressive reading list for young women which includes Callimachus, Philetas, Anacreon, Sappho, Terence, Propertius, Gallus, Tibullus, Varro, Virgil, and Ovid himself. I think it would be pedantic to imagine that only libertines took Ovid's advice.

immortal for his brachial strength rather than for brain power. The fact that the *Odusia* was conceived as a schoolbook does not detract from the importance of the work (it is, therefore, pointless to deny its humble origins in order to enhance its dignity). Certainly the book would not have found such wide acceptance, had it not reflected, in some way, the ideas of Livius' patrons in particular and those of the Roman aristocracy in general.

Our picture of Andronicus' public becomes even more complex when we take into account his dramas. If the first audience for his epic was small (his own private students), the first audience for his dramas was the largest possible; for public performances on the stage[1] reached people regardless of their reading habits and even of their level of literacy. In fact, the very beginnings of Roman literature show that the most important avenues for its promulgation were schools and theatres. Yet whereas the role of schools as a bulwark of literature remained unchallenged throughout antiquity and even in Christian times, the theatre, on the other hand, from the period of the late republic degenerated into mere show-business. Moreover, drama maintained such a close connection with pagan mythology that the Christians felt obliged to lead a war of annihilation against it. The almost total loss of early Roman tragedy is to be deplored all the more since this type of literature commanded the largest possible sphere of influence.

With Naevius, the relationship between author and public changed radically. A free citizen of an important Italian town, he was independent of literary patronage—except for the acceptance of his plays by the *aediles*. His status as a free citizen of Capua gave him, in spite of his sympathetic response to Roman patriotism, that modicum of independence inaccessible to Andronicus and Ennius. The towering figure of the patron, for him, is replaced by his fellow citizens of Capua who certainly would have despised even the slightest servility in him. Instead of writing for one man and one city, Naevius had to face the public of two cities, a fact which enhances his stature as a poet as well as the intellectual and moral compass of Latin literature. By then the Latin language was no longer limited to the city of Rome and to Latium and had become, therefore, a suitable medium to reflect an Italian identity. Interestingly enough, it is he who shows us soldiers preferring death to a shameful return to their fellow citizens. It is his

---

[1] The first Latin drama (in the style of Greek drama) was performed in 240 B.C. (Cicero, *Brut.* 18. 72).

experience as a denizen of a small town, therefore, that enabled him to express moral values in terms of social control, values which his later readers would consider typically Roman.

His successor, Ennius, was a foreigner from southern Italy. Cato the Elder brought him to Rome, where he would become a client of several Roman generals. The martial outlook of his patrons is clearly reflected in his poems, coexisting rather than blending with the author's Greek humanism and taste for wisdom and peace. The evening dialogue between a tired general and his learned companion, as it appears in one of the fragments (*Ann.* 234-251 Vahlen = 268-286 Skutsch), reflects the exchange of thoughts between author and reader which is central to the *Annales.* As a great Roman's confidant, the poet had to understand completely his friend's views on man and life. Thus it became possible for those foreigners to put into words Roman feelings and ideas, and Ennius' *Annales* could be accepted by a Roman society as an expression of its own mentality.

The *Annales* were written after the Second Punic war. Once more, the scope and the horizon of the Roman audience had broadened considerably. In the meantime Sicily had become an integral part of the *imperium,* and Greek culture had penetrated the Romans' daily life: Greek statues were omnipresent and, along with less sublime blessings of civilization, Greek comedy and tragedy, in a Latinized form, had become part of a large public's aesthetic experience.

Ennius, who in his tragedies transferred Greek mythology to Rome, ventured at the same time in his *Euhemerus* to unmask gods and heroes as divinized humans. The Roman senators who sponsored Ennius were by now familiar enough with Greek things to allow the poet to present himself as the new Homer and, what is more, to use even Homer's metre. This was not a very obvious choice, since Latin is much less rich in short syllables than Greek is. The wealth of spondees available in Latin lent the Latin hexameter a certain *grauitas,* which, if somewhat un-Homeric, was perfectly in tune with the serious and solemn character of the genre. Another typical feature of the Latin hexameter is the frequency of the breathing pause in the midst of the verse, the so-called penthemimeral cæsura. It clearly divided the line into a "rising" and a "falling" part and invited the poets to search for verbal symmetries and different types of "word-architecture" which would become even more prominent in Latin than in Greek poetry.

As for the content of his epic, Ennius was bold enough to credit his audience with some interest in philosophy. He would not have posed as Homer reincarnate if his readers had been totally ignorant of Pythagorean doctrines nor would he have dared to praise wisdom at the cost of brute force: "For to fight out a quarrel by blind force—it is a thing of blockhead boars beloved"[1] (*nam ui decertare sues stolidi soliti sunt, Ann.* 105 Vahlen, 2nd. edition = 96 Skutsch). These examples show that Roman epic poets were not satisfied with reaffirming the values of a given society, but ready to reshape them in view of a more civilized future. Ennius even anticipated the outstanding importance of Roman law: "Justice is better than bravery", *melius est uirtute ius* (*Trag.* 155 Jocelyn). It is against this broad and "modern" background that the well-known quotations concerned with *moribus antiquis* should be read.

Along with the rapid rise of the cultural and intellectual level of their Roman audience, the epic poets had to take into account an increasing awareness of generic laws among their readers. Accordingly, Ennius reacted to learned critics of Homer and tried to avoid the "mistakes" they had pointed out. He successfully Latinized the Homeric metre, similes, and many epithets. However, he did not try to compete with the tight and calculated overall structure of the *Iliad*.

It was left to Virgil to make this last step. This poet was happy enough to live in a circle of sophisticated connoisseurs who appreciated his thorough-going assimilation of both Homeric and Hellenistic epic, Hellenistic historiographical techniques, as well as poetic and rhetorical theory. As for the content of the *Aeneid*, the end of the civil wars created a climate in which a Roman epic centred on a single hero could be written, and this allowed Virgil to conceive a unified plot. He competed with the *Iliad* by replacing the destruction of a city with the birth of a city; he emulated the *Odyssey* by having his hero search for an Italy which was the country of both his descendants and his ancestry. The *Aeneid* would be unthinkable without the fact that in the meantime the Roman empire had grown to cover the known world and seemed to fulfil both Alexander's and the Stoics' dreams of a *cosmopolis*. Both in form and in content, therefore, unique historical conditions made possible the naissance of the *Aeneid* as an *Iliad* and *Odyssey* reborn.

---

[1] Translation: E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Latin*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1935, repr. 1967).

Expectations of the public concerning literary genre could be formulated only by a small group of readers. For the pioneers of Latin literature there could be no generic expectations on the part of their audience, at least as far as Latin traditions were concerned. Eduard Fraenkel has shown that the earliest Latin writers tried to introduce artificial differences of style between the literary genres they handled.[1] These self-imposed laws are all the more striking since Greek readers who knew the models would probably not have cared to read the Latin imitations, and early Roman readers, who did not know the Greek models, would have taken the Latin texts at face value. In Virgil's time there were certainly readers who could compare him to Ennius, Apollonius, and Homer; and Virgil rewarded them by subtly playing on their expectations which resulted from such knowledge. He even tried to please those who, armed with the sharp weapons of literary theory, knew better than Homer himself what Homer ought to have written. Thus, the vast amount of literature familiar to his readers helped Virgil to create a new kind of epic in which the tradition would be present, not in its own right, but subservient to a new goal. Our poet did take into account all of the expectations of his most learned readers, but he was not enslaved by them either.

In later days the "double citizenship" which had been first experienced by Naevius provided productive tension between place of birth and place of creative activity. This is not only true of elegiac poets: Propertius would not pass over in silence the sufferings inflicted on Perusia by Octavian; Ovid would be proud of having been born near the centre of Italian resistance against Rome. It might even be that Horace (*Carm.* 3. 30. 10-11) referred to the writer's glory in his South-Italian homeland. Of Virgil, the epic poet of Rome, it must be said that his first home was at the Mincius near Verona, and his second home was not Rome but a beautiful place near Naples. Thus, even this poet looks at Rome from a certain distance (he stresses this contrast himself at the end of the *Georgics*).

The epic poets' awareness of an Italian audience started with the political unification of Italy. With the growth of the empire the scope of this audience would evolve into a "world wide" reading public (see Ovid, *Met.* 15. 877); hence, Augustan poets linked the survival of their work to the existence of the Roman empire. Yet Ovid in his exile

---

[1] See E.Fraenkel, "Livius Andronicus", in: *RE*, Suppl. 5 (1931): 598-607, and idem, "Naevius", in *RE*, Suppl. 6 (1935): 622-640.

poetry even appealed to his large public against the emperor who had banished him. Here the place traditionally reserved for the patron or, later, the emperor, was given to the gentle reader or even to "posterity". Since the works of Horace and Ovid were originally not contained in the school syllabus, they were read by people who liked their poetry. This element of freedom, which is natural with lyrics and love elegy, was transferred to epic in Ovid's *Metamorphoses.* All this was a by-product of the Augustan régime which made the traditional political career unattractive. Hence, private life and love, which until now had been only a secondary aspect of a Roman's existence, tended to become the very essence of it. Of this new and quickly spreading outlook in which politics play only a marginal role, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is the Magna Charta. The survival of this epic is not only proof of its relevance to the public of its time, but also of the public's influence on the fate of books. Ovid was happy enough to find this collective patronage.

At the same time, natural philosophy began to attract more attention. The lonely forerunner on this seemingly un-Roman avenue of interest had been Lucretius. Virgil, by a stroke of genius, had reconciled natural philosophy with agriculture, the most Roman of all pursuits. In Ovid, nature acquired an importance of its own, independently of Rome. In fact, we have proof that in the early imperial period educated Romans turned to natural philosophy. Along with the moderate Pythagoreanism of Virgil and Ovid, there is Manilius' Stoic view of man, encouraged perhaps by Tiberius' penchant for astrology. Nero's solar theology is reflected in Lucan's independent mind, on which Seneca's scientific teachings were not wasted. Being an aristocrat, Lucan does not hesitate to abandon his royal patron for a pessimistic view of history and mankind, and even refuses to accept the sacred conventions of literary genre; breaking away from epic objectivity, he pulls out all the stops of rhetoric to lament the events of the civil war or to comment on them to his audience.

In the meantime, the personal patronage of the emperor had become the rule, including the risk of falling prey to his jealousy and vindictiveness, as was the case with Lucan. The *Pharsalia,* in its unachieved state, is a document both of Lucan's exceptional talent and of Nero's incompetence as a critic of art. The crucial importance of Rome as the seat of the emperor and of a sophisticated audience is confirmed by the fact that the great tradition of Latin epic breaks off

after Domitian. Under this emperor, Rome was still the centre of the world. Not only did he build a palace which represented the universe, but he was also, as a new Jupiter, the true head of an efficient administration, which was located in the city. Last but not least, he encouraged poetry through contests and patronage.

The revival of epic in late antiquity was fostered by the patronage of high officials and emperors. In the case of Claudian, the importance of the public is evident: in spite of his Greek origin, this poet wrote in Latin, which was the language of his Roman audience and the only language he had in common with his hero Stilicho. Similarly, the choice of the Latin language by Corippus is explained by the need to make Byzantine politics palatable to a Latin-speaking North African readership.

The impact of the audience and of the historical circumstances is especially felt when a work comes to be accepted as a national epic. Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum* was composed after the First Punic War when Italy was unified and Rome was challenged to find a new identity. The *Annales* of Ennius could not have been written without the Second Punic War, which marked a new stage in the assimilation of Greek culture. Virgil's *Aeneid* appeared at the critical moment between republic and empire, civil wars and Augustan peace. Answering the challenge of great historical events, each of these epic poems propounded a new view of man, society, and nature. In doing so, they partly reflected the mentality of their audience and partly shaped it by introducing new ideas. Even the Latin epic poems of the Silver Age (many of which are deemed "anachronistic") cannot be understood without taking into account the attitude of their contemporary public. Lucan's *Pharsalia* reflects both the messianic expectations and the deep delusions of the Neronian age. Finally, the prolific period of epic under the Flavian dynasty reveals a new identity, produced not by war, but by peace: the complete fusion of Greek and Roman cultures into a new Græco-Roman identity.

Forms of Contact between Author and Reader

Latin epic was meant to be read aloud. In Augustan times and later, recitation was the usual way of making recent poetry known to a circle of friends. In Juvenal's time the public reading of mythological poetry was so common that the satirist expected the columns of recitation halls to be cracked by the vibrations of constant reading (*Sat.* 1. 13).

More and more, Latin epic poets came to establish communication between themselves and their audience by means of rhetorical techniques, so that rhetorical influence made itself increasingly felt, even in poetry. Let us, therefore, have a look at different forms of communication between author and reader.

At a distance of two thousand years, the influence of an author on his contemporary readers is difficult to grasp. In some cases, however, we are able to discover in the later works of an author hints of critical reactions to his earlier works. The Prologues of Terence are early examples of this type of text. Catullus, in *Carmen* 16, reacts to attacks on his *basia* poems; in the *Remedia amoris*, Ovid answers the critics of his *Ars amatoria*, and the 2nd Book of his *Tristia* is an apology of his person and works against the charge of immorality. In principle, epic does not particularly encourage direct reference to the reader on the part of the author. Nevertheless, Ennius in his *Annales* distanced himself from his predecessor Naevius, probably in a preface; Ovid, in his epilogue to the *Metamorphoses* mentioned his world-wide audience as a bulwark of his immortality, even against Jupiter's wrath. The epic authors' influence on later poets will be discussed below under the heading of intertextuality (pp. 13-21).

Personal comments of the author are extremely rare in epic; if at all, they appear at moments especially loaded with emotion. Thus, when Patroclus asks Achilles to send him into battle, in a famous aside Homer abandons the epic poet's traditional reserve, comments on Patroclus' ignorance of his imminent death, and shares the author's prescience with his listeners (*Il.* 16. 46-47). In Latin epic, Virgil praises Nisus and Euryalus after their death in a personal address (*Aen.* 9. 446-449); Lucan (who shows a preference for personal comments quite unusual in epic), following in Virgil's footsteps, apostrophizes his hero Caesar *sub specie aeternitatis* (*Phars.* 9. 980-986); on these occasions, both Virgil[1] and Lucan stress the immortalizing power of their poetry, and thus indirectly introduce a form of self-portrait into their work.

In his *Metamorphoses*, Ovid makes the reader his confidant and accomplice whenever he inserts some ironical comment on the credibility of the old stories he is telling, e.g.: "Who would believe what followed, did not ancient tradition bear witness to it?"[2] *Quis hoc*

---

[1] Cf. *Aen.* 9. 446-449.

[2] Translation: *The Metamorphoses of Ovid.* Transl. by M.M.Innes (Harmondsworth, 1955; many reprints), slightly modified in our next quotation; cf. M. von

credat, nisi sit pro teste uetustas? (Ovid, *Met.* 1. 400), or, even more irreverently: "She has the face of a maiden and, unless all the poets' tales are false, she was, in fact, a maiden once" *Virginis ora gerens et, si non omnia uates / ficta reliquerunt, aliquo quoque tempore uirgo* (ibid., 13. 733-734). In this text we definitely hear two, even three voices. The surface meaning is quite innocent: Scylla is now a monster, whereas previously she had been a maiden. Ovid's malicious humour comes to the fore as soon as we recall the model he is evoking. Virgil's Venus appears to Aeneas in the guise of a maiden (*uirginis os habitumque gerens,* Virgil, *Aen.,* 1. 315); by way of the allusion, then, Ovid intimates that even she, who is the goddess of sexual love, might have been, once upon a time, a maiden, if the poets can be trusted. This condition reveals a third level of meaning: the author establishes a secret understanding with his reader concerning the scarce reliability of poets as witnesses and undermines a naïve reading of his own text. Of these three levels, one is literal (it stays within the boundaries of the given text); another is intertextual (it sheds some unexpected light on a previous text); the third level is "poetological" (it refers to the text as a piece of literature and fiction). This last level of meaning is closely linked with the author's making contact with his reader and creating some complicity, which enhances the distance between the reader and the story and furthers a detached type of reading.

Other hints given by the author inform the reader in advance of events to come and thereby enable him to follow the narrative more critically. There are different forms of explicit announcement or indirect foreshadowing. Direct announcement is found in the *Iliad* (16. 46-47): "So Patroclus made his appeal. But how simple he was! Had he but known it, he was praying for his own doom and an evil death".[1] In the *Aeneid* (10. 501-505) Virgil comments on Turnus who strips the corpse of Pallas of his belt: "Ah, mind of man, so ignorant of fate, of what shall befall him,/ So weak to preserve moderation when riding the crest of good fortune! / For Turnus a time is coming when he'd give anything / To have left Pallas unharmed and will loathe this day and the spoils / It brought him".[2] More indirect in

---

Albrecht, *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion* (Hildesheim, 1963, 2nd ed. 1994); id., "Umgangssprachliches in Ovids *Amores*", in: *Mousopolos Stephanos.* Festschrift H.Görgemanns (Heidelberg, 1998).

[1] Homer, *The Iliad.* Transl. by E.V.Rieu (Baltimore: Penguin, 1950; many reprints).

[2] *The Aeneid of Virgil.* Transl. by C.Day Lewis (Oxford, 1952; paperback: Garden City, New York, 1953).

form (though explicit in content) are prophecies pronounced by one of the characters involved in the action; an example is Hector who, dying, predicts the death of Achilles: "Nevertheless, pause before you act, in case the angry gods remember how you treated me, when your turn comes and you are brought down at the Scæan Gate in all your glory by Paris and Apollo" (*Iliad* 22. 358-360). Because this kind of prophecy goes beyond the scope of the *Iliad*, it does not guide the reader's attention to a future development in the text, but conveys to the reader a more correct understanding of Achilles' fate as viewed in a larger context.

Various stylistic means[1] are used to give some guidance to the reader. In the examples quoted above the future tense, which is rather rare in narrative texts, catches the eye. In Ovid's Daedalus story, a gerundive serves the same purpose (*Met.* 8. 211-212): "He kissed his son (the last kisses he would ever give him)"[2] *dedit oscula nato / non iterum repetenda suo.* Other hints are hidden in adjectives. At an early moment of the Daphne myth the god's love for the girl is termed "fruitless" (*Met.* 1. 496): "and high the hopes that stoked his fruitless passion" *et sterilem sperando nutrit amorem.* The idea of fruitlessness is also intimated by the preceding simile, which evokes the light stubble blazing up in the harvest fields after the ears have been reaped (*demptis aristis, Met.*1. 492). Such devices, by informing the reader of events to come, give him an advantage over the characters involved in the action.

The contrary effect is produced by withholding information from the reader to create suspense and to foster emotional involvement. An example is Ovid's Daedalus story. Until Icarus' death, the reader is allowed to follow the loving father's tragedy with deep empathy. Only as an afterthought is the fact revealed that Daedalus previously had killed Perdix, his talented nephew. The result is that, in retrospect, what had seemed to be a tragedy turns out to be a story of crime and punishment.

In the following paragraphs we will dwell on the epic poet's use of the reader's knowledge of previous writers as a secondary language conveying additional messages.

---

[1] Vocabulary, cases, tenses, modes; imagery: metaphor, simile, metonymy, etc.

[2] Ovid, *Metamorphoses.* Transl. by A.D.Melville (Oxford, 1986; paperback: Oxford, 1987).

Intertextuality as Part of a Poetic "Language"

When writing literary texts, ancient authors often transform texts they have read. But it would be rash to consider a text merely a product of the absorption and the transformation of other texts. What is important in each single case is the author's intention. He is, in principle, free to choose his own subject and point of view. Direct or indirect reference to other texts or patterns of thought becomes a useful (and even necessary) tool as soon as he wants to convey his ideas to a given audience. To refer to other texts, therefore, is to refer to the presence of those texts in the memories and expectations of readers. Rather than a mere condition of a text's readability, intertextuality[1] is part and parcel of the "language" used by an author to reach his public. Of course, intertextuality, can also work in the other direction: a comparative study of two texts from different epochs may shed light on the earlier text as well. In fact, such a study

---

[1] Cf., for example, J.Kristeva, *Semeiotike. Recherche pour une semanalyse*, Paris 1969, and her article "Narration et transformation", *Semeiotica* 1 (1969): 443 "We call intertextuality that textual interaction that occurs within a single text. For those in the know, intertextuality is a concept which indicates the manner in which a text reads history and inserts itself into it". Evidently, in this context, any cultural system or structure can be regarded as a "text"; for a critical appraisal, see M. Pfister, "Konzepte der Intertextualität", in: *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen und anglistische Fallstudien*, ed. by U.Broich and M.Pfister, Tübingen 1985, 1-30; G.B.Conte, *Genres and Readers. Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny's Encyclopedia*, transl. by G.W.Most with a foreword by C.Segal, Baltimore 1994, 132: "In my view, genre must be thought of as a discursive form capable of constructing a coherent model of the world in its own image. It is a language, that is a lexicon and a style, but it is also a system of the imagination and a grammar of things. Genres are the expressive codifications of culture's models." ... "In certain cases, intertextuality reveals the interferences between different worlds, expressive universes composed of different, sometimes neighbouring ideas and languages." ... 134: "In short, I called genre a context of codifications which selects allusions and polarizes it for itself thereby making them pertinent." 137: "If we agree to believe that literature is made up by texts that absorb and transform other texts, then intertextuality, so far from being only a curious echo effect becomes the very condition of literary legibility." So far, so good. But there is a strange confusion of cause and effect in the following sentence (137): "The addressee who approaches the text—a reader or an imitator (also a kind of reader)—is himself already a plurality of other texts and codes." I would prefer to respect the reader's human dignity and say that he "knows" or " is aware of" those texts and codes. For an overview of recent research on intertextuality: U. Draesner, *Wege durch erzählte Welten. Intertextuelle Verweise als Mittel der Bedeutungskonstitution in Wolframs Parzival*", Frankfurt 1993 (= *Mikrokosmos* 36), 37-68. She shows how the notion of intertextuality developed from Bakhtin's principle of "dialogue" in a context conditioned by Russian formalism, how it profited from a "receptionist" approach and how it was integrated into the dimension of history. For a defence of the author and his intention: S.Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998).

assists in the discovery of traditions common to both texts and of features typical of either of them.

Influence of authors on later writers can include imitation in an affirmative sense which may amount to amplification or concentration. The alternative type is imitation by contrast: here we find inversion of meaning, of roles, of chronology, of spheres of action and imagery, or of main narrative and secondary narrative.

A literary epic such as the *Aeneid* can be read in different ways, ranging from the schoolboy's naïve approach to the scholar's sophisticated reading. One of the miracles of great literature is that it can be understood fruitfully on more than one level, none of them being absolutely superior to the other, nor all of them mutually exclusive. There are several levels of reference. On a basic level, the story of Aeneas can be enjoyed simply in its own right; additional dimensions of insight and delight are added, however, when the reader has a thorough knowledge of Homer and is able to read Virgil's references to his predecessor not only as learned allusions but as a system of signs. Not unlike a dark foil such references help Virgil to set off his own intention. Thus, the expectations of a reader who knows his Homer will allow him to measure more precisely the originality of Virgil. Intertextuality here may be considered an instrument recording the exact degree of an author's originality with seismographic precision.

An author's influence is especially obvious to us when later writers explicitly refer to him. Affirmative reference can be seen for instance in *Aeneid* 10. There Jupiter foretells that there will be a battle of the gods during the Punic Wars, a clear allusion to one of Ennius' battle descriptions. Here is a witness for facts which, somehow, are a part of the "world" of the *Aeneid*. The *Annales*, though, are not thought of as a book but as part of the Roman people's memory. (It is telling that the Latin word for "history" is *memoria rerum gestarum*). In Book 14 of the *Metamorphoses* Mars, wishing to remind Jupiter of his promise to turn Romulus into a god, quotes a line from Ennius: "One shall there be whom thou shalt bear up to the azure blue of heaven"[1] *unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli* (14. 814). Here again the story told by Ennius is felt to be real and to form an integral part of the world of the *Metamorphoses*. The relationship between Ennian prophecy and Ovidian fulfilment is comparable to the way the New Testament refers

[1] Translation: Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, transl. by F.J.Miller (London, 1916).

to Old Testament prophecies.[1] Regardless of who wrote the texts, these are considered as components of one whole, of a collective memory; the authors are witnesses of facts rather than writers of books. The relationship between analogous figures in Virgil and Homer can be described in terms of "types" and "antitypes".[2] A key passage is the description of the doors in Book 1 of the *Aeneid* with scenes from the Trojan War. These scenes have a double function: one the one hand, they recall Aeneas' past; on the other, they typologically foreshadow the battles to come in the last part of the *Aeneid*. This literary method is a corollary of the fact that, for Aeneas, the search for his future will be connected to the discovery of his real origin.

To classicists, an intertextual approach is anything but new. But it was hampered by terminological problems which appeared in the wake of the Romantic revolt against "imitation". In fact, the ancient term of *imitatio* had been a keyword of literary criticism from the Renaissance to the Baroque era.

Originally, *imitatio* was linked to authoritative persons or texts. Among late medieval readers, a book called *Imitatio Christi* (ascribed to Thomas a Kempis) was a favourite. It rejected a merely bookish study of the Bible and recommended a shaping of one's own life into the image of Christ: "If thou knewest by heart the entire Bible and the sayings of all philosophers: what would all this avail thee without God's love and grace?": *Si scires totam Bibliam exterius, et omnium philosophorum dicta: quid totum prodesset, sine charitate Dei et gratia?* (1. 3) "He who wants to understand fully and judiciously the words of Christ has to strive for shaping his entire life into His image" *Qui autem uult plene et sapide Christi uerba intelligere, oportet ut totam uitam suam illi studeat conformare* (1. 2). It was only a small step from religious *deuotio moderna* to the humanists' no less reverential absorption of secular texts. A forerunner of the humanists had been Statius who in his epilogue exhorted his *Thebaid* to follow the *Aeneid* at a respectful distance: "Nor rival the divine *Aeneid*, but follow afar and ever venerate its footsteps"[3] *Nec tu diuinam Aeneida tempta, / sed longe sequere et uestigia semper adora* (12. 816-817). Here we find an author's humble

---

1 Cf. K.Berger, *Wer war Jesus wirklich?* (Stuttgart, 1995): 141-143.

2 G.N.Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer* (Göttingen, 1960 = Hypomnemata 7, 1964): 354-356, with reference to E.Zinn.

3 Translation: J.H.Mozley, *Statius. With an English Translation*, vol. 2 (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1928, repr. 1961).

attitude to an authoritative earlier text expressed in religious terms (*diuinam; adora*). The verb *sequi* conveys the adherence to a teacher who is regarded as a model. This reminds us of Lucretius who addresses Epicurus: "'Tis thee I follow, thou glory of the Greek race"[1] *te sequor o Graiae gentis decus* (3. 3). The image of *signa* and *uestigia* evokes the written letters of the texts: "And in thy deepset prints firmly now I plant my footsteps, not in eager emulation but rather for love, because I long to copy thee" *inque tuis nunc / ficta pedum pono pressis uestigia signis, / non ita certandi cupidus quam propter amorem / quod te imitari aueo. Imitari* implies closer adherence than *certare* (cf. Lucr., ibid. 5-6), but it is anything but mechanical imitation. This is illustrated by the bees simile (Lucr., ibid. 10-13): "And from thy pages, our hero, even as bees in flowery glades sip every plant, we in like manner browse on all thy sayings of gold, yea, of gold, and always most worthy of life for evermore" *tuisque ex inclute chartis, / floriferis ut apes in saltibus omnia libant, / omnia nos itidem depascimur aurea dicta, / aurea, perpetua semper dignissima uita.* It is perfectly clear that the bees do not mechanically absorb pollen but thoroughly assimilate it and produce honey, which is something completely new and their own.[2] *Imitatio,* therefore, is anything but the production of a mechanical copy. Even Byron, who is considered a romantic, still used the term "imitation" to distinguish a free adaptation from a mere "translation". Soon however, the 19th century rejected disdainfully the term "imitation" in the name of absolute originality. Modernism pretended to be anti-romantic, but, instead of dethroning the romantic cult of originality, idolized it. As a result, even today "imitation" is regarded as a term unsuitable for literary criticism; nor does the less pejorative term of *aemulari* (Lucretius uses *certare*) satisfy the needs of modern scholarship, although Latin authors of the Silver Age notoriously try to outdo or surpass their predecessors.[3] Clearly, not all intertextual relationships can be explained by means of "emulation". The latter term fosters a misunderstanding to which philologists are prone.

---

[1] Translation: C.Bailey (Oxford, 1947, several reprints).

[2] Cf. Seneca, *Epist.* 84. 3-5, esp. 5: *Sed ne ad aliud quam de quo agitur abducar, nos quoque has apes debemus imitari et quaecumque ex diuersa lectione congessimus separare (melius enim distincta seruantur), deinde adhibita ingenii nostri cura et facultate in unum saporem uaria illa libamenta confundere, ut etiam si apparuerit unde sumptum sit, aliud tamen esse quam unde sumptum est appareat.*

[3] G.Williams, *Change and Decline. Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1978), insists on the fact that *amplificatio* often becomes an aim in itself.

Owing to our professional deformation, we tend to believe that for an author the evocation of a previous text is an aim in itself whereas, in reality, intertextuality is part of the "language" and "rhetoric" used by the author to reach his audience.

A great step forward in our approach to intertextual relationships was F.Cairns' book *Generic Composition* (Edinburgh, 1972). He rightly stressed the fact that similarities between texts are often owing not to direct "imitation", but to generic affinities. Among the constructive principles of genre is inversion; examples are *Aeneid* 4. 305-330 and 365-387 (an "inverse propemptikon"). A second aspect is "reaction": the writer makes the speaker or addressee "react" to the generic situation or speech. This involves a change of mind at some point within a text. Cairns takes his examples from elegy (Ovid, *Amores* 3. 11 with the change of point of view in the middle), though such changes can also be found in epic. Ovid switches from one point of view to another when describing a metamorphosis from a subjective point of view and then confirming it objectively (*Met.* 9. 782): "the goddess seemed to move/ Her altar; yes, it moved!" *uisa dea est mouisse suas - et mouerat - aras.* Further categories discussed by Cairns are "inclusion" (not exactly "mixing of genres", because the included generic example fully retains its own generic identity), "speaker-variation" (in *Aeneid* 1. 65-75 Juno employs prayer style and Aeolus responds in hymnic style), and "addressee-variation".

It is useful to distinguish different degrees of explicitness of intertextual references. The most explicit form of establishing intertextuality is direct reference to the name of an author or to the title of a work. We saw that, at the end of his *Thebaid,* Statius explicitly mentions the *Aeneid* and exhorts his *Thebaid* to follow this "divine" model at a distance without competing or tampering with it. When a great author's name or the title of his work is mentioned, this implies an authoritative role of the previous text and a respectful and reverential adherence to it on the part of the younger poet. Modern readers who are not used to this kind of self-effacing language should not take it at face value, for Statius is not implying that he is a mere "imitator". Rather, the continuation of his text shows that, for the future, he expects to gain an authoritative role himself: "Soon, if any envy as yet o'erclouds thee, it shall pass away, and, after I am gone, thy well-won honours shall be duly paid."[1] *mox, tibi si quis adhuc*

---

[1] Translation: s. above, n. 3, p. 15.

praetendit nubila liuor, / occidet, et meriti post me referentur honores (*Theb.* 12. 818-819). Statius' contemporary, Silius Italicus (cf. ch. XII.1), devotes special paragraphs to the praise of his predecessors in epic: Homer (13. 778-797), Ennius (12. 384-419), and Virgil (8. 592-594). It is appropriate that the least known of the three, Ennius, is named explicitly, whereas the identity of the other two is too self-evident and too sacred to be named.

Second, authoritative texts are conjured up by means of quotation.[1] An especially meaningful instance is (cf. ch. V. 5) the allusion to Catullus' *Lock of Berenice* in Aeneas' speech to Dido (*Aen.* 6. 460: "It was not of my own will, Dido, I left your land"[2] *inuitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi*; Catullus 66. 39: *inuita, o regina, tuo de uertice cessi*). At first glance, the quotation looks playful. What does Virgil's epic hero have in common with a lock of an Egyptian queen? The answer can be identified through the context of the passage recalled by the quotation: the lock is quite unhappy to have been cut away from its queen and would even abandon its place in the skies to return to her. Now, since Aeneas has followed the orders of the Gods to fulfil his mission he cannot express personal feelings which are contrary to his destiny. The quotation, however, allows him to convey an indirect message by means of allusion (cf. also ch. VII; XIV).[3] Aside from specific verbal reminiscences there are other ways of alluding, such as similarities of structure (e.g., the appearance of a Nekyia in Book 6 of an epic), analogies between scenes (the encounter of Aeneas and Dido in the other world reflecting Ulysses' address to Ajax in the *Odyssey*, ch. V.

---

1 "Quotation is the literal reproduction of a verbal text of a certain length [...] with (in) a verbal text, wherein what is reproduced forms an integral part of some work and can easily be detached from the new whole in which it is incorporated": S.Morawski, "Basic Functions of Quotations", in: A.J.Greimas (ed.), *Sign-Language-Culture*, The Hague/Paris 1970, 690-705 (esp. 691). Classicists often exaggerated their search for textual parallels. Of course, many so-called parallels are a corollary of the nature of the Latin language or, in the course of time, had become "common property" of all Latin epic poets. All such parallels help us reconstruct what ancient readers may have felt when hearing a given expression; but they do not necessarily imply that the author deliberately referred to an individual passage in the work of one of his predecessors. It is wise, therefore, to limit the discussion of parallel passages to instances, where a strong case can be made for the intentional character of the reference to an individual text.

2 Translation: C.Day Lewis (Oxford, 1952; paperback: New York, 1953).

3 Literary allusion is "a device for the simultaneous activation of two texts": Z.Ben-Porat, "A Poetics of Literary Allusion", *PTL. A Journal of Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 (1976) 105-128, esp. 107; for a modern defence of allusion: S.Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998).

5), or typological analogies between characters (Aeneas and Hector, Turnus and Achilles).

What is the function of the poet's play on such crossings of texts in his reader's mind? By relying on their readers' knowledge of previous epic poems (as well as of other genres), Latin epic poets can adopt the figures and the images of their predecessors as "abbreviations" to communicate more quickly and efficiently with their listeners than through explicit interpretative discourse. An extreme example is Silius Italicus (ch. XII. 1) who composed an historical epic. For him, writing after Virgil meant giving confirmation of the historical realization of Rome's potential which in the *Aeneid* was sketched as a mythical prototype, equivalent to expounding historical realizations of the potential which Virgil had sketched in the *Aeneid* as a mythic prototype. The *Aeneid* serves as a prism through which Silius can focus the multiplicity of Roman historical events and figures. His permanent reference to the *Aeneid* allows him to discover the principles which constitute an element of constancy and identity in the ever-changing panorama of the life of the Roman people. Yet, just as there are numerous typological parallels, there are also important typological contrasts. Unlike the shield of Aeneas which enhances the hero's *pietas* and the heroic achievements of his descendants, Hannibal's shield illustrates the breach of the truce, the general's unruly nature and his character so adverse to Roman *fides.*[1] The very fact that Silius introduces the description of a shield allows him to spare his readers a plethora of explanations. Indeed, Hannibal's un-Roman nature and his wickedness cannot be thrown better into relief than against the background of the Virgilian shield of Aeneas.

In Silius' Claudia story (ch. XII. 2), intertextual relationships in the narrower sense of the word allow the reader to discover crossings and differentiations of genres, i. e. phenomena of "intertextuality" in the larger sense of the word. An especially interesting later case is the fusion of epic and biblical imagery in a Christian epic poet like Corippus (ch. XIV). Valerius Flaccus (ch. X) interprets the myth of the Argonauts against the background of Virgil's *Aeneid* and its panorama of universal history. Hercules, who had been assigned a considerable role in the eighth Book of the *Aeneid* (where he foreshadowed Augustus), in Valerius Flaccus represents an important historical line leading from Jupiter to the Romans. Flaccus, who was a

---

[1] See my *Silius Italicus* (Amsterdam, 1964), 175.

Roman priest also unites in his Jupiter the qualities of the Zeus of epic and of Jupiter, the god of the Roman state. From the standpoint of hermeneutics[1] it is intriguing to observe how Valerius' concept of Jupiter reflects the poet's historical situation and perspective: the *Argonautica* is laid in a distant past, long before the Roman age, but Valerius' view of Jupiter and history is conditioned by the *Aeneid*. Thus, the Zeus of the Argonauts directs their fates in view of a remote Roman future and, as a result, an originally Greek myth becomes part of a new Roman identity.

"Intertextual" relations, therefore, go far beyond the scope of the narrative syntax of epic. They cannot be treated adequately without considering their deep semantic implications. One of the reasons for this is that epic texts, to the Romans' mind, especially contributed to the definition of a collective identity. In a different context, we had occasion to point out surprising links of continuity leading from Virgil's to Dante's bees simile:[2] in Virgil the bees symbolize the Roman people, in Dante the heavenly host. The *populus Dei* appears as a transfigured avatar of the *populus Romanus*.

Although epic commands a public voice, each individual poet changes the genre. The author of a literary epic is not the anonymous speaker of his time. His public voice has private undertones.[3] Even outside the political and historical sphere, intertextuality has a strong impact which cannot be overlooked. The continuity of the genre allows the individual author to feel as if he were a link in a chain of generations building a huge cathedral and including into it even representations of secular life. Similarly epic is enriched by elements from other genres, such as love elegy and even of philosophical anthropology. Before Achilles meets and rapes Deidamia, Statius compares her to three goddesses: Venus, Diana, and Minerva (ch. XI). So she is the perfect incarnation of womanhood in all its aspects: sensitive, vegetative, and intellectual. Curiously enough, Claudian would come back to the same three goddesses to prepare the rape of Proserpina (ch. XIII). He evidently was aware of the anthropological pattern behind this triad and meaningfully incorporated it into his mythological and didactic poem on the origins of agriculture and civilization.

---

1 Hermeneutics is the philosophical theory of interpretation.

2 *A History of Roman Literature* (Leiden 1997): 683-686.

3 J.B.Hainsworth, *The Idea of Epic* (Berkeley, 1991): 4-10.

No less intriguing is the way "intertextuality" (in the broader sense of the word) operates between different genres or even between different cultural systems within a given text. As early as 1924, Wilhelm Kroll had observed the importance of the crossing of genres in Latin literature.[1] F. Cairns[2] justly preferred the term "inclusion", since the elements introduced from other genres into epic maintain their original generic character. In several instances, I therefore use the term "clash of genres" (or even of cultures) (Ch. IV, VI.4, VI.5; cf. XII.2). In Claudian, for example, mythological and didactic epic merge as they had done earlier in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, an epic poem, which its poet had enlivened with strong elegiac elements. Statius in describing the erotic encounter of Achilles and Deidamia (ch. XI) followed in the footsteps of Ovid, who had told the same story in his *Art of Love*. Lucan, in his attempt to eschew myth, created a fruitful symbiosis of history and natural philosophy (ch. IX).

All of these are attempts to convey new ideas through an extremely traditional literary genre which seemed to admit of almost no innovation. It turned out, however, that the epic genre was surprisingly receptive to new trends. In fact, it was owing to its strong intertextual traditions that it became such a suitable and convenient vehicle for expressing views on man's position in the universe and in history.

Rhetoric as a Device of Intertextuality

Natura - ars - imitatio - exercitatio

Four times did Latin epic arise against the background of a fully developed practice of oratory. First, the pioneers of Latin epic could not have created their poetic language, if there had not been the linguistic arsenal of Latin political and forensic oratory and of Roman law. At a later point, the acme of Augustan poetry would follow the heyday of Latin prose in the Ciceronian age. The great poets deployed their literary art with a basis in a mature rhetorical practice and theory. This fact, which has not yet received the full attention it deserves, determined the specific approach of the Augustans to their poetic task. In the Silver Age the style of its greatest representative, Lucan (ch. IX), cannot be understood without reference to the late

---

[1] "Die Kreuzung der Gattungen", in: *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*, Stuttgart 1924, repr. Darmstadt 1964, 202-224.

[2] *Generic Composition* (Edinburgh, 1972): 159-165; 175.

Augustan schools of declamation, which had been regularly attended and competently described by his grandfather, Seneca the Elder. That type of oratory inspired Seneca the Younger to shape a new style of Latin prose, a manner of writing which, in its turn, also strongly influenced the poetry of his nephew, Lucan. Finally, in late antiquity, the prose style of panegyric orators preceded the panegyric verse of the greatest epic poet of that age, Claudian.

The genesis of Roman epic, therefore, strongly suggests that we should not neglect the impact of rhetoric and oratory on poetry. The influence of the practice of oratory, for example, is felt in the vocabulary and style of epic. Rhetorical theory has an impact on the invention, disposition, and elocution not only of speeches, but of entire scenes and books. Instructions regarding introduction, narrative, argument, and peroration are put to use by the poets. Moreover, psychological and literary doctrines advanced by the theorists of rhetoric, such as Aristotle's teachings concerning anger or the distinctions he made in the domain of guilt and responsibility, have left visible traces in Latin epic (ch. V. 4). In the present book it is not our intention to label individual poetic expressions with rhetorical terms. We would rather draw our readers' attention to the fact that the communication and the interplay between author and reader has a specific quality or character in Latin epic, because all of the authors (and many of their readers) were trained in rhetoric. The interplay between the epic poet and his public gained a high degree of consciousness. What is relevant on the following pages are the individual shades discernible in each passage rather than the rhetorical terms as such. Rhetoric is present, not as a pedantic set of rules, but as an arsenal of tools which, in a broader sense, became part of the "language" used by the author to reach his readers, a language, which, in turn, is liable to become an object of poetic play.

The basic requirements for an orator are talent (*natura*), rhetorical theory (*ars, doctrina*), the absorption and reproduction of good models (*imitatio*), and practice (*exercitatio*). For an epic poet, *natura* and *exercitatio* are both indispensable and difficult to grasp; they are beyond the scope of our present discussion. The keywords *ars* and *imitatio* describe roughly the two fields covered by our modern terms "rhetoric" and "intertextuality". Let us now consider some rhetorical aspects of Latin epic.

Inuentio

Inuentio, which is the first of the orator's tasks (*officia oratoris*), does not imply a *creatio ex nihilo* of a completely new subject or plot; for, the orator's first duty is not to invent, but to *find* all arguments relevant to his case. In so doing, the speaker would first have to make up his mind as to what general strategy to follow in his speech. For example, within the *genus iudiciale* he could choose between several strategies[1] with each of these general lines of defence implying a totally different choice of arguments. Now, since all Latin epic poets have studied rhetoric, we might expect them also to play on rhetorical categories, above all in speeches, which are particularly likely to have been invented according to rhetorical principles. Yet, while the term *inuentio* applies literally to the speeches found in Latin epic poetry, it also applies metaphorically (if not principally) to the poets' approach to their subject matter, to their point of view. Thus, against the background of an epic such as Ennius' *Annales*, which tells the events of the Second Punic War as part of the past, we can better appreciate the originality of the invention of Virgil who, conversely, incorporated the events of Roman history into his *Aeneid* as parts of a future viewed with a prophet's eye. Another fundamental aspect of Virgil's invention led him to modify his mythological material. Before Virgil, nobody had believed that Italy was not only Aeneas' promised land but also the homeland of his ancestors. This new element is an integral part of the poet's invention because it allows him to describe Aeneas' journey towards a new identity in terms of a rediscovery of an old identity. Thus, it becomes possible to project the pattern of "Ulysses' return" onto a process which encompasses an entire chain of generations.

The design of the 2nd Book of the *Aeneid* is a masterstroke of rhetorical invention (ch. V. 2). Aeneas, who has abandoned his city and his king, gives us an account of his flight which is so brilliantly motivated that most of the readers of the *Aeneid* are ready to forget that he actually is a *desertor Asiae.* A rhetorical interpretation certainly cannot do justice to all aspects of Book 2, but it helps us to appreciate the extremely high level of Virgil's use of rhetorical categories.

---

[1] To give an example, a person accused of homicide could either completely deny the fact (*status coniecturalis*) or admit it. In the latter case there was another choice: he could either maintain that it was not murder, but justifiable homicide (*status finitionis*). If he could not deny that it was murder, he could either argue that it was tyrannicide (hence morally meritorious: *status qualitatis*) or declare that the judges were not competent (*status translationis*).

As for the invention of individual scenes, the encounter of Aeneas and Dido in the Underworld (ch. V. 5) is successfully transferred from a secondary character onto a protagonist: Ajax plays no role elsewhere in the *Odyssey* whereas Dido is a towering figure in the first part of the *Aeneid.* Moreover, Virgil establishes a tight network of references between the scene and the rest of the *Aeneid.* In Aeneas' last address to Dido, Virgil uses an extreme form of *ordo artificialis* and thus disconnects the causal links between the facts related. Although it would be too simple to explain this procedure as a method of dissimulating the full extent of Aeneas' responsibility, the rhetorical roots of the invention of this speech are clear; Virgil uses a rhetorical device to attain a poetic goal. The same is true for his gallery of heroes in Book 6 (ch. V. 3), where he boldly inverts the usual pattern of apocalyptic texts and confronts his readers with the souls of the Roman heroes, not after their death, but before their birth. This unusual perspective allows him to capture the driving forces behind Roman history *in statu nascendi.* Even more surprisingly, Virgil's invention of the fight of Turnus and Aeneas can be shown to be based on categories developed in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (ch. V. 1). In this case, rhetoric turns out to be relevant to the invention of three successive scenes and to our assessment of this hero as a "tragic" hero.

The highly artificial character of Virgil's invention is not a "late" feature in Roman literature. From the beginning, Latin authors were trained scholars. The pioneers of Roman epic had to create not only their subject matter, but also a suitable language to convey it to their public, as can be seen in the fragments of Livius Andronicus (ch. II).

Dispositio

The second task of the orator is to find out the best possible arrangement of his arguments (*dispositio*). The *Aeneid* shows a clear overall design, a Roman "Odyssey" (Books 1-6) followed by a Roman "Iliad" (Books 7-12), and between the two halves of the work there are instructive parallels and contrasts: in Book 1 Juno persuades Aeolus to raise a sea-storm against Aeneas, and in Book 7 she sends a fury to unleash a great war. Book 2 describes the destruction of a city, Troy, while Book 8 prepares the birth of a new city, Rome. At the end of Book 2, Aeneas carries his father on his shoulders; at the end of Book 8 he shoulders the shield on which the deeds of his descendants are to be seen.

The principle of *dispositio* is evinced in individual books as well: for example, in Book 2, the appearance of Hector is deliberately placed before the beginning of the struggle for Troy. Thus, Aeneas informs his addressee, Dido, and his readers beforehand that all resistance will be in vain. This allows them to appreciate even more the courage and devotion which Aeneas will deploy in his hopeless struggle (ch. V. 2).

A striking example of unusual *dispositio* in an individual scene is the encounter of Dido and Aeneas in the underworld (ch. V. 5), where the events of Dido's life are given in reverse chronological order. This highly artificial *dispositio* is vindicated not only by the mechanism of our memory (the more recent an event, the more easily it is recalled) but also by the author's intention to show Aeneas' effort to "digest" the tragic events for which he felt responsible.

Since these two examples are speeches, the application of rhetorical categories is not only justified, but necessary. The former example is a plea before a live audience, the latter an address directed to a dead person. It should be noted that in the second case there is no answer, so that the speech ultimately turns out to be a mere inner monologue of Aeneas. In fact, scholars have observed that as early as in the *Aeneid* many epic speeches remain without an answer. We will see later that in imperial poets speeches often do not have the primary goal of persuading a person; persuasion proves either unfeasible or superfluous (ch. XI), and as a result, an answer to the speech is often omitted. In the case of Dido, an answer is impossible, since Aeneas does not deserve it. If an addressee is already convinced, as is the case with Lycomedes in Statius' *Achilleid*, a reply is unnecessary. In spite of their uselessness as vehicles of persuasion, the speeches under discussion are well constructed according to the rules of rhetoric. The reader is invited to enjoy other aspects of them (e.g Thetis' art of deception). As in a drama, the public has the pleasure of knowing more than poor Lycomedes and savours this intellectual advantage.

Elocutio

Among the *uirtutes dicendi, Latinitas* (correctness) and *perspicuitas* (lucidity) are requirements that go without saying. Much more important to our context, however, is *aptum* which is, basically, a social principle. To enhance an orator's credibility, a speech must be consistent with the speaker (his social rank, his age, etc.), the addressee, and the situation. In poetry, such appropriateness is an

indispensable requirement of character portrayal. Horace is more than justified, therefore, in devoting a long paragraph of his *Ars Poetica* to a detailed discussion of *aptum*.[1] In our interpretation of Statius' *Achilleid* (ch. XI), we notice how successfully the poet takes into account both Achilles' youth and his fierce nature; the result is a charming mixture of a lovely child and an angry young man. Here a poet plays on the interferences of two different social codes. Whereas *aptum* belongs to the domain of rhetoric, the interpenetration of two different types of *aptum* is a clear example of intertextuality (in the larger sense of the word).

In the field of *elocutio*, the influence of contemporary oratory (and rhetoric) on epic is demonstrable. Just as the richness and fullness of Cato's orations finds its poetic counterpart in Ennius' *Annales* (ch. IV), so was Cicero's classical prose style matched by Virgil's classical epic language. Virgil's use of narrative tenses (ch. V. 7) shows, that the great poet was able to confer a deeper meaning even on simple phenomena of grammar. Seneca's preference for brilliant aperçus preceded Lucan's rhetorical epic. Claudian's poetic panegyrics could not have been written without the fully developed rhetorical technique of prose panegyrics. This is not to reduce the poets' achievements to rhetorical categories, but to show from what material they started and on what elements they based their sophisticated dialogue with their readers. In the case of Valerius Flaccus' use of participles (ch. X), however, it is poetry that paves the way for prose: as a master in the clair-obscure, he anticipates some features of Tacitus' style.

An important part of *elocutio* is the choice of appropriate similes. As early as Ennius (ch. IV), the style of the Homeric simile was modified by rational elements like antithesis and by rhetorical aims such as the transposition of the culmination from the middle to the end of the simile. Virgil's similes (ch. V. 6) combine the epic tradition of Homer with the rational approach of the Hellenistic tradition represented by Apollonius and Ennius to create a network of intertextual references both within and outside of the *Aeneid*. Ovid's similes (ch. VI. 3), in their subject matter, are less dignified and closer to every-day life than Virgil's while their functions are less defined by symbolic references than by their position in their narrative context. Lucan, in the

---

[1] For a discussion of *decorum* and *aptum* with special regard to Cicero and Horace: J.Styka, *Estetyka stosowności (decorum) w literaturze rzymskiej* (Kraków, 1997 = *Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Prace Komisji Filologii Klasycznej*, n^{o} 26).

manner of good orators, accompanies his introductory analysis of the origins of the civil war with a calculated sequence of images illustrating each single point (ch. IX). Statius, in his similes, makes a sophisticated use of Virgil and Ovid (ch. XI), as does Claudian with Virgil, Ovid, and Statius (ch. XIII). Finally, Corippus (under the influence of epic, rhetoric, and Christianity) creates a new type of intertextuality by finding a common denominator for epic and biblical imagery (ch. XIV).

The use of imagery in Latin epic is partly conditioned by the tradition of heroic poetry; partly it can be explained in terms of rhetoric. One goal in this respect which orators and poets have in common is *euidentia* (ἐνάργεια), the principle of imagining events "as if they happened before our eyes".

Virgil's Dido, who is unmoved by Aeneas' plea, stands like a marble cliff (ch. V. 5). This is a sculptural, static image. Other poets (Ovid, Statius, and Claudian) often evoke an action in swift motion, and encourage us to imagine it most vividly, thus achieving, by means of speech and rhetoric, what the cinema does in a less indirect way.

In the choice of words and expressions, defamiliarization is a device typical of both rhetoric and poetry. Albinovanus (ch. VII) conveys to his readers the experience of sailing through the darkness of the Northern Sea, as if they felt all of the dangers for the first time. If we inquire into how he managed to do so, we find rhetorical means like metaphor, anaphora, hyperbolic expression, onomatopœia, etc. In Claudian (ch. XIII) the Netherworld, viewed through the eyes of Pluto, becomes quite a jolly prison, almost a *locus amoenus*.

Breuitas

Initially, *brevitas* was not reckoned among the *uirtutes dicendi*; it was left to the Stoics to introduce it. If we compare the succinct address of Brutus with the fully developed discourse of Antony in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, we see that in a speech brevity may turn out to be detrimental. In epic poetry, brevity is not an absolute value either. It is most effective if viewed against a broad and copious background. Brevity carried to an extreme amounts to silence, as can be seen in the last encounter of Aeneas and Dido (ch. V. 5); there Dido's silence brilliantly unmasks the futility of Aeneas' expenditure of speech. The Homeric model, Ulysses' one-sided dialogue with dead Ajax (ch. V. 5), is quoted in the *De Sublimitate* 9. 2, a masterpiece of ancient literary criticism, as the classical example of sublime style achieved

through silence. The rhetoric of silence is no less important than the rhetoric of speech.

Genus subtile, medium, grande

The rhetorical theory of style is built on a distinction of three levels, *genus subtile, genus medium,* and *genus grande.* In epic, one should expect the *genus grande* to prevail. In Ovid's stories of divine love, there is a fascinating mixture of epic style and colloquial language (ch. X): Juno's vocabulary is no more sublime than that of any jealous Roman wife: *concipit! id deerat!* (*Met.* 3. 268). If we compare Ovid's Io story to the same myth as told by Valerius Flaccus we find an intriguing interpenetration of different stylistic spheres in Ovid. Again, the stylistic devices as such are subject to rhetorical analysis whereas the mingling of diverse stylistic levels can be interpreted best in terms of intertextuality (in the larger sense of the word). The seemingly easy elegance of Ovid's arrangement of words (*compositio uerborum polita*) considerably differs from Flaccus' style which, in some respects, seems to anticipate the deliberate harshness of a Tacitus (*compositio aspera*).

Memoria

Memory played an important role in Roman literature and in Roman society. Every young student of rhetoric was subjected to a systematic training of his memory. Orators were supposed to know their speeches by heart, and admirers of orators, such as Seneca the Elder, remembered until their old age large portions of orations they had heard in their boyhood. The same was even more true of poetry. A Latin epic poet of the Silver Age could trust that most of his educated readers knew large parts of Virgil and Homer by heart. The presence of these texts in the memories of the public was a *condicio sine qua non* for the writing and reading of new epic poetry. Every modern reader of classical epic texts has to take into account this basic situation; it is a prerequisite for understanding intertextual relationships in classical antiquity.

Partes Orationis

From the tasks of the orator let us now turn to the parts of his speech. In ancient Rome, every student knew that a speech should have an introduction (*exordium, prooemium*). Further parts were *narratio* (usually the account of how the crime was perpetrated), *argumentatio*

(a methodical presentation of arguments), *excursus* (a digression), and *peroratio* (a conclusion). Much of the experience of generations of orators proved applicable to Latin epic.

Prooemium

When beginning a speech an orator was supposed to make his listeners attentive, benevolent, and ready to learn. In the introductions of epic poems the *captatio beneuolentiae* can be superseded, as is seen in the *Aeneid.* Later epic poets, however, follow the example of the *Georgics* where the ruler is addressed in laudatory terms. Our analysis of the *exordium* of the *Aeneid* (ch. V. 1) shows that Virgil manages to prepare his readers for a text which, in many respects, defies traditional categories. By his art of exploiting not only words, but also positions, he draws a mental map of what will follow. Moreover, he integrates into his epic proem elements typical of the prose prefaces of historians (the so-called ἀρχαιολογία).

In his introduction to the Arachne story, Ovid (ch. VI. 2), not unlike a good advocate, carefully prepares his readers for an unconventional reading of the traditional legend. In fact, he loosens the connection between hybris and punishment by mentioning the vindictive intentions of the goddess even before the commission of Arachne's crime. Moreover, he raises our sympathy for Arachne by recalling her humble origins and the fact that her glory was based exclusively on her art. The privileged position of this prologue invites the reader to discover its importance to the entire work, from Ovid's personal preface to his epilogue.

Narratio

The theory of classical rhetoric concerning *narratio* was especially suitable for forensic speeches. In this part of his discourse the orator had to give special heed to plausibility and credibility. Obviously, a mistrusting judge could be persuaded only by means of a narrative which gave the impression of perfect truthfulness. Any excess in stylistic beauty or rhetorical adornments could prove disastrous. The teachers of rhetoric, therefore, recommended to their students to use an extremely plain, simple, and straightforward style in this part of the plea.

In epic, these rules could not be applied without reservations. Actually, Aeneas' account of the destruction of Troy (ch. V. 2) is miles away from the dryness required by our manuals of rhetoric. Cicero

himself had most successfully neglected this rule in his *Verrinae*, where, especially in the parts that were not meant for actual delivery, real gems of elaborate rhetorical narrative are found.[1]

Lucan's epic narrative (ch. IX) is a poetic development of the highly emotional narrative style adopted in the *Verrinae*. On the other hand, Silius Italicus in his Claudia story (ch. XII) returns to the traditional objectivity of epic style. In fact, he strips his narrative of the emotional overtones it had acquired in Ovid's elegiac version.

Argumentatio

Argumentatio as a part of a plea was conceived by the theorists of rhetoric as a separate category although in practice it often could not be separated from the *narratio*. In the 2nd Book of the *Aeneid* Aeneas' arguments are conveyed implicitly through his narrative (ch. V. 2). In his last address to Dido in *Aeneid* 6 (ch. V. 5), Aeneas by choosing a highly artificial anti-chronological order disconnects the chronological ties between the events and in doing so reduces the impact of causality (and, indirectly, of his responsibility). In a lawsuit, arguments are exchanged by way of dialogue. In the present scene, the strongest argument against Aeneas' "plea" is Dido's silence.

Digressio

To grant the audience a moment of rest, orators included an *excursus* into their speeches. In good pleas, all digressions were closely connected to the subject matter and formed an integral part of the speaker's strategy.[2] In Latin epic, excursuses play an important role. Some of them are in the vein of historiographic tradition, such as the so-called ἀρχαιολογία which follows the introduction (ch. V. 1) or geographical excursuses (cf. ch. IX). Others are part of the epic tradition; consider the catalogues of heroes (ch. V. 3) or peoples. Although modern readers might tend to skip them, these catalogues serve important purposes. In Virgil they evoke the presence of the Roman community (the catalogue of heroes in *Aeneid* 6) and of Italy (the catalogue in *Aeneid* 7). In Lucan, catalogues help to convey the idea that the entire physical world is involved in the war (ch. IX).

---

1 See, for instance, M.von Albrecht, *Masters of Roman Prose* (Leeds, 1989): 33-53.

2 See, for instance, M. von Albrecht and H.Vester, *Ciceros Rede Pro Archia. Deutung und unterrichtliche Behandlung* (Heidelberg, 1970).

Descriptions of works of art perfectly illustrate the fact that this type of "digression" is intimately linked to the main narrative. Some examples are Aeneas' and Hannbal's shield (ch. XII) and Arachne's and Proserpina's tapestries (Ch. VI. 2 and XIII. 1). These descriptions illustrate the moral attitude of the characters and the philosophical background behind the narrative.

Peroratio

In Roman speeches the ending is especially loaded with emotion. Here the orator tries to rouse the anger or compassion of his judge. Many books of the *Aeneid* exhibit a finale liable to involve its readers deeply. This structure is closer to rhetorical than to Homeric usage, because in many books of Homer the climax is found in the middle, in Virgil at the end.

Conclusion

To sum up: a study of rhetorical elements in Latin epic is likely to show both the usefulness and the limits of the application of rhetorical theory to poetry. The speeches we analyze in Statius' *Achilleid* (ch. XI) or in Claudian (ch. XIII) confirm the fact that, in the imperial period, oratory had lost much of its practical importance. As early as in Virgil we discover the positive side of this loss, the development of an inner monologue and the discovery of an inner world. Poets use the technical devices well-known to the teachers of rhetoric, but they transform them from a means of persuasion into a tool of applied psychology (ψυχαγωγία) on a larger scale: they invite their readers to fathom the minds of the *dramatis personae* and to share their adventures, to get involved with their inward experiences or, again, to take a distant look at them.

In the early imperial age, rhetoric had lost some of its practical impact on politics, but it maintained and even enhanced its all-pervading influence in the field of education. In the schools of rhetoric, declamation became an art practiced by specialists, enjoyed by a public of connoisseurs and studied by the youth. No poet could disdain that art, although, unlike the philosophers, he would not use rhetoric for moral improvement. He would rather enjoy the fact that the art of rhetoric had been largely emancipated from its former practical purposes and could help him study the psychology of his characters and give his readers competent guidance through his poetic world.

How is rhetoric related to our basic theme of intertextuality? Two contrasting approaches are possible. First, if we take intertextuality in a narrower sense (interaction of verbal texts in the reader's mind), we may regard it as a tool of the author's "rhetoric", of his verbal impact upon his readers. In this case, "rhetoric" must be written in quotation marks as the word is used metaphorically. Second, if we take "intertextuality" in the very large, metaphorical sense it has acquired in modern scholarship (interaction of cultural systems in a given text), the interaction between the generic traditions of epic and the system of rhetoric which both authors and readers have learned at school can be interpreted in terms of "intertextuality". We prefer the latter approach, since it seems to be much more promising than any attempt to subject poetry mechanically to rhetorical categories.

Special points of contact are found in the realm of *memoria*, which allows diverse literary, generic, and cultural traditions to be present in the minds of authors and readers. Intriguing instances are the crossing or inclusion of different genres (we give special heed to the inclusion of elegiac traditions into epic: ch. VI; XI; XII 2) and of "reaction" (in the sense F.Cairns gave to this word), i.e. in cases of rapid changes of point of view on the part of the author (ch.VI).

In the chapters of this book, the use of rhetorical devices is studied as a phenomenon of "intertextuality" in the broader sense of the word. What matters is not a mechanical application of rhetorical labels to poetic texts, but the discourse between author and reader in which the reader's knowledge of rhetoric is used as a tool to facilitate communication. What can be observed in this process? At first glance, rhetoric seems to be "instrumentalized" in a poetic context. On closer inspection, however, we discover the contrary, that it is both "emancipated" and "emancipatory": it is no longer subservient to practical goals and the huge intellectual and emotional potential it commands lends wings to poetic invention and to a poetic study of psychology.

Hence, rhetoric is not something alien to Latin epic poetry, but part and parcel of its poetic language within the framework of intertextuality.

CHAPTER TWO

LIVIUS ANDRONICUS

Inuentio. *The Rediscovery of the* Odyssey *and the Invention of a Poetic Language*

The Right Word in the Right Place

"Tell me, O Goddess of Song, of the clever man"[1] *Virum mihi, Camena, insece uersutum.* The first line of Latin epic is intriguing in several respects. Livius does not adopt the hexameter, which is the traditional metre of Greek epic. He chooses the Saturnian, which is more familiar to his Roman public,[2] and his experience with Greek poetry allows him to create his own type of Latin Saturnians. Since with

---

[1] Translation: E.H.Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin*, vol. 1. (London, 1936). Text: *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum*, ed. W.Morel (Lipsiae, 2nd ed., 1927); new ed. by J.Blänsdorf (Stuttgart, 1995); E.Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993). Bibl.: G.Broccia, *Ricerche su Livio Andronico epico* (Padova 1974); K.Büchner, "Livius Andronicus und die erste künstlerische Übersetzung der europäischen Kultur", *SO* 54 (1979): 37-70; R.Cappelletto, "Livio Andronico, Odyssea *fr.* 31 Mor (=22 Mar.)", *RFIC* 112 (1984): 413-416; G.Erasmi, "The Saturnian and Livius Andronicus", *Glotta* 57 (1979): 125-149; E.Fraenkel, "*Livius*", *RE* Suppl.5 (1931): 598-607; H.Fränkel, "Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen I," *Hermes* 67 (1932): 303-311; H.Flashar, "Formen der Aneignung griechischer Literatur durch Übersetzung", *Arcadia* 3 (1968): 133-156; S.M.Goldberg, "Saturnian Epic: Livius and Naevius", in: Boyle, A.J. (ed.) *Roman Epic* (London and New York, 1993): 19-36; J.M. Kearns, "Σεμνότης and Dialect Gloss in the *Odusia* of Livius Andronicus", *AJPh* 111 (1990) 40-52; F.Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1913): 55-75; S.Mariotti, *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica* (Milan, 1952); E.Neu, "Übersetzung—Möglichkeiten und Grenzen", *Humanistische Bildung* 9 (1985): 55-92; A.Ronconi, "Sulla tecnica delle antiche traduzioni latine da Omero," *SIFC*, n.s. 34 (1962): 5-20; A.Seele, *Römische Übersetzer. Nöte, Freiheiten, Absichten. Verfahren des literarischen Übersetzens in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Darmstadt, 1995); G.A. Sheets, "The Dialect Gloss, Hellenistic Poetics and Livius Andronicus", *AJPh* 102 (1981) 58-78.

[2] As our material is scarce and heterogeneous (where are the limits between "rough Saturnians" and "solemn prose"?), there is no unanimity among scholars concerning the origin (Indo-European, Italic, Greek) and the nature of this metre (syllabic, tonic, quantitative). The most probable guess is that the Saturnian had initially been an accentual verse with fairly fixed boundaries between words (see my *History of Roman Literature* [Leiden, 1997]: 43 f. with a diagram and bibl.), but was then interpreted in terms of Greek quantitative metrics; this development began very early, with Livius Andronicus himself, who was, of course, imbued with Greek culture.

Ennius the hexameter became the standard metre of Latin epic, we need not discuss here the nature of the Saturnian at length. It is, nevertheless, useful to take note of two basic facts. First, despite differences in interpretation, all scholars agree that in the Saturnian metre the boundaries (and the number) of words within each line are relevant.[1] We will see in a moment that some principles of poetic arrangement of words, which can be observed in the fragments, would set the tone for Latin epic and even survive the change of metre. Second, the Saturnian line falls into two parts which differ slightly from each other.[2] There is an interplay between a "rising" and a "falling" part of the line. A similar bipartite structure will also prevail later on in the Latin hexameter.

A long distance hyperbaton like *uirum* ... *uersutum* was much less common in old Latin than it was in Greek. We know that Latin prose admitted hyperbaton only under certain, well-defined conditions[3] and that because of the early impact of Greek rhetoric, orators enjoyed slightly greater freedom than historians in this respect. In Livius' first line, however, Greek influence does not explain everything. First, he would not have ventured to reproduce the word order of his model, if the Latin language had not offered him some natural basis for doing so. After all, hyperbaton is one of those features which popular and poetic language have in common. Its function is to emphasize the unity of a given sentence.[4] Second, Livius gives greater

---

[1] G.Erasmi (quoted above, n. 1, p. 33): 149: "It seems evident from the preceding analysis that the Saturnians of Livius tend to be characterized if not defined by either a pyramidal construction that allows for concentrical reading or by verse divided into two cola usually linked by alliteration, often characterized by rhyme correspondence." Moreover, her article contains pertinent observations on the differences between Livius and Naevius.

[2] S.M.Goldberg (quoted above, n. 1, p. 33) observes that, in ca. 125 Latin Saturnians, each line is divided by a caesura into two slightly different cola, with the second half being shorter than the first by 1-3 syllables. Often the name of the father is placed before the caesura, whereas *filius* or *filia* appears after it; thus, the caesura is bridged to some degree. Ends of sentences tend to coincide with the ends of lines.

[3] A.W.Ahlberg, "De traiectionis figura ab antiquissimis prosae scriptoribus Latinis adhibita", *Eranos* 11 (1911): 88-106.

[4] Colloquial hyperbata are found in Cato's *De agricultura*. The following quotations from W.Wundt are enlightening: "In a sentence like *magna dis immortalibus habenda est gratia*, the entire expression (which is rather long) is tied together to form a unit by the words *magna gratia* which are related to each other both logically and grammatically. This unit renews, as it were, the basic unity of an overall idea and puts it before our eyes" (*Völkerpsychologie. Eine Untersuchung der Entwicklungsgesetze von Sprache, Mythus und Sitte.* Vol. 2: *Die Sprache.* 2nd Part [Leipzig, 3rd edition, 1912]: 367). Ibid. 370: "Of course, it is difficult to decide in each single case if

prominence to the hyperbaton by his use of alliteration (*uirum* ... *uersutum*) and by having the length of the sentence coincide with the length of the line; in the Greek model the end of the sentence is not identical with the end of the verse:

> ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ πλάγχθη

In Livius' first fragment, the word *Camena* is placed in the centre of the line and it is framed by two pairs of words, which bracket each other, *mihi* ... *insece* and, as an outer shell, *uirum* ... *uersutum*. In Livius' text, therefore, symmetry is even more pronounced than in the Greek model, where the μοι ἔννεπε is not split up.

Symmetry will continue to play an important role through Roman art and literature.[1] More precisely, the type of word architecture found in this line will recur later in many hexameters, e.g., *Venturae memores iam nunc estote senectae* (Ovid, *Ars* 3. 59), where the first and the last word are closely related to each other; the sentence *memores* ... *estote* is split up to fill the second and the penultimate position, and the important words *iam nunc* are placed in the middle. This is only one of hundreds of examples. Livius Andronicus seems to have set a trend. Of course, he could not have done so, had this type of word-architecture not appealed to his contemporary and later readers as typical of the Latin language and congenial with their sense of style.

Parallelism was another structural principle cherished by Livius. Let us compare *frg.* 4 Morel = 6 Blänsdorf with the corresponding Homeric lines (*Odyssey*, α 136-137).

> *Argenteo polubro, aureo eclutro*
> χέρνιβα δ'ἀμφίπολος προχόῳ ἐπέχευε φέρουσα
> καλῇ χρυσείῃ ὑπὲρ ἀργυρέοιο λέβητος.

---

the difference of stress or the unifying tendency prevails. But in all probability both always coexist to some degree: the overall idea compels the speaker to round off the sentence clearly, whereas the way in which this is done is mostly conditioned by differences of logical and emotional accent. ... All of these effects, at the outset, are produced unintentionally. They are natural products of a specification of an overall idea in the course of the sentence. An artificial use ... as a means to achieve rhetorical effects must be a secondary phenomenon, based on extant forms of connection of ideas, which have arisen spontaneously within the language". Cf. ibid. 242: "The sentence as a differentiation of an overall idea".

[1] For symmetry in Roman art, see G.Kaschnitz von Weinberg, *Das Schöpferische in der römischen Kunst* (Hamburg, 1961): 54-70, esp. 63-64; K.Schefold, *Römische Kunst als religiöses Phänomen* (Hamburg, 1964): 19; 29; 59-60; 67; a link to Roman centralism is established by F.Altheim, *Italien und Rom.* Vol. 1 (Amsterdam and Leipzig, sine anno): 168 and 193.

By changing the Homeric word order Livius stresses the parallel structure and introduces a gradation (from silver to gold); both changes reveal a striving for rhetorical effect. This increase in symmetry implies, however, that a good deal of the Homeric fluency is lost (a phenomenon we had already observed when discussing *frg.* 1).

Creating an Epic Style

Let us now turn to Livius' vocabulary. Even in his days a word like *insece*, which is etymologically identical with the Greek ἔννεπε, had a highly archaic ring.[1] We could quote many such archaisms deliberately used in his *Odusia*.[2] They are proof of the fact that Andronicus wanted to make the linguistic character of this work stand out against that of his dramas.[3] It appears that the distinction of generic styles is as old as the beginnings of Roman literature.[4] Yet, while generic differences were felt to be important throughout the history of Latin literature, especially in Latin epic,[5] we should note that in Roman literature such differences were not part of some "natural" heritage but purposely created by the authors.

The genealogical circumscription of names is another device of sublime style. The Muse is called *diva Monetas filia* (*frg.* 23 Morel = 21

[1] The only other instances are: Ennius, *Ann.* 326 Vahlen = 322 Skutsch (a passage clearly inspired by Livius) and Gell. 18. 9. 1, where the context compels us to restore *insecenda* in a quotation from Cato (Cato, *Or. frg.* 10. 1). The word was so archaic that, in Gellius' days, only few scholars understood it correctly.

[2] J.M.Kearns (quoted above, n. 1, p. 33), in a learned and well-documented article, proved that Livius Andronicus enhanced his epic style by using archaisms, not glosses.

[3] Thrice we find archaic genitives in *-as* (*frg.* 12; 21; 23 Morel = 31; 19; 21 Blänsdorf). With the exception of *familias*, such forms occur only in epic (in Naevius and Ennius); they are missing in the dramas written by Livius and his successors. Even the inscriptions attest *-ai*, not *-as*. Other deliberate archaisms are: *filie* (*frg.* 2 Morel = 2 Blänsdorf), *dextrabus* (*frg.* 37 Morel = 29 Blänsdorf), *dusmo loco* (*frg.* 31 Morel = 33 Blänsdorf), *homonem* (*frg.* 20 Morel = 18 Blänsdorf; cf. Enn., *Ann.* 138 Vahlen = 125 Skutsch; the manuscripts read *humanum*, a reading defended by K.Büchner, *Römische Literaturgeschichte* [Stuttgart, 1957]: 41 [not quite convincing], see now Kearns, [quoted above, n. 1, p. 33]: 45 "*Homones* may have been one of the many variant forms of classical words attested in early Latin", linguistic bibliography ibid.), *fitum est* (*frg.* 29 Morel = 32 Blänsdorf), *nequinunt* (*frg.* 13 Morel = 11 Blänsdorf; drama knows only *danunt*), *quamde* (*frg.* 20 Morel = 18 Blänsdorf; attested later in Ennius and Lucretius).

[4] The fact that Livius wanted to imitate the "glossematic" speech of the Homeric poems is stressed by J.H.Waszink, "Tradition and Personal Achievement in Early Latin Literature", *Mnemosyne*, ser. 4. 13 (1960), 16-33, esp. 24-25.

[5] Archaizing forms like *olli* or *aulai* are found in Augustan times only in the *Aeneid*.

Blänsdorf), and Apollo appears as *filius Latonas* (*frg.* 21 Morel = 19 Blänsdorf). The use of such ceremonious patronymics was part of the epic tradition, but for Livius' public it also evoked the dignity of "senatorial" style;[1] the poet thus linked his creation of a Latin generic style to the social categories of Roman family clans and oratory.

The hieratic diction of rituals was another native arsenal of dignified expression (*frg.* 14 Morel = 12 Blänsdorf): "Hallowed queen, Saturn's daughter"[2] *sancta puer, Saturni filia, regina.* Livius lends Homer the archaic attire of Roman *grauitas.* Was there any other people who turned "heaviness" into a virtue?[3]

The Language of Emotions

The influence of archaic formal prose and of oratory converge to create a highly emotional style. Livius intensifies the impact of his text on the reader by an extensive use of alliteration, which is typical of early Roman prose and poetry. Even in the first line of the *Odusia* the function of alliteration (*uirum ... uersutum*) is not limited to structure. In other cases Livius increases *pathos* by apostrophe (*frg.* 38 Morel = 4 Blänsdorf): *neque tamen te oblitus sum, Laertie noster.*[4] Eumaeus apostrophizes Ulysses as if he were absent, without suspecting his master's presence; thus, Livius adds to the irony of the passage.[5]

It is a well-known foible of bad and good translators to adorn with adjectives the nouns found in their originals.[6] The epithets added by

---

1 U.Knoche, "Über die Aneignung griechischer Poesie im alten Rom", *Gymnasium* 65 (1958): 321-341, esp. 333, cf. also *frg.* 15 Morel = 13 Blänsdorf: *Nympham Atlantis filiam Calypsonem.*

2 Translation: Warmington, see above, n. 1, p. 33.

3 On *grauitas*: G.Dumézil, "*Maiestas* et *grauitas*", *RPh* 26 (1952): 7-28; O.Hiltbrunner, "*Vir grauis*", in: *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung. Festschrift A.Debrunner* (Bern, 1954): 195-207; A.Weische, *Studien zur politischen Sprache der römischen Republik* (Münster, 1966 = *Orbis Antiquus* 24): 38; it is true that Plato gives ἐμβριθής a similar meaning (Hiltbrunner 199-200).

4 F.Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen* (Berlin, 2nd ed. 1912): 41 compares *Odyssey* ξ 144 and υ 205, where there is no apostrophe. On our *frg.* 38 Morel = 4 Blänsdorf, cf. A.Barchiesi, "Livio Andronico, Omero, e l'ironia drammatica (*Odyssea, Fr.* 38 Morel = 20 Mariotti)", *RFIC* 113 (1985): 405-411.

5 Broccia (quoted above, n. 1, p. 33) tentatively relates Livius' *frg.* 38 Morel = 4 Blänsdorf to *Odyssey* ω 400; but the parallel is not compelling.

6 Leo (quoted above, n. 4): 91 notes that the verbs used by Livius (*macerat* and *confringent*) render the effect, not the image (*confringent* is drawn from συνέρρηκται [*Odyss.* θ 137]); I cannot accept his judgement that Andronicus "broadened the wording ... without any poetic profit" (ibid.).

Livius greatly differ from Homer's which objectively reflect the essence of a person or a thing. Livius omits many such attributes; instead he heaps up adjectives or adverbs that appeal to the reader's feelings (*frg.* 20 Morel = 18 Blänsdorf): "For nothing wastes a man worse than cruel sea. The man whose strength is great—him will the savage waves without speed shatter."

namque nullum peius macerat homonem [1]
quamde mare saeuom: uires cui sunt magnae
tamen topper confringent importunae undae.

The passionate tone of the passage reflects the Roman peasants' aversion to the sea. Livius replaces visual with acoustic elements and precision of contour with emotional intensity. In accordance with Hellenistic literary theory Livius adorns his text with rhetorical[2] elements (alliteration [*macerat - mare - magnae*, *tamen - topper*], hyperbaton [*uires ... magnae*], chiastic word order [*mare saeuom ... importunae undae*]). If we judge these facts in terms of "translation" we might conclude with Leo that Livius is an "unskilled translator"; but this is a modern and inappropriate perspective. More intriguing is a phenomenon of intertextuality in the larger sense of the word, the intersection of a foreign literary tradition (represented by the Greek model) and the cultural background and social code of Livius' Roman public. Even the "dynamic" elements observed in the present text, which are quite unlike Homer's "visual" approach, reveal a difference in outlook; a parallel is the "sculptural" and anthropomorphic concept of Greek gods as opposed to Roman gods who are powerful but invisible.[3] Typical is an adjective like *magnus*, which in our text is accompanied by its archaic synonym *saeuom*. These attributes would persist, together with *ingens*[4] (one of Virgil's favourites), as a hallmark of Latin epic language. However, it would be premature to conclude that the Romans replaced quality with

---

[1] Blänsdorf reads *humanum* (which is the manuscript reading) and omits *tamen* (which actually is an editor's addition) before *topper*.

[2] The use of rhetorical figures is reminiscent of Hellenistic technique; on Antimachus cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.1.53 (*uis et grauitas et minime uulgare eloquendi genus*), cf. G.A.Sheets, "The Dialect Gloss, Hellenistic Poets and Livius Andronicus", *AJPh* 102 (1981): 58-78; the importance of glosses is overstated here, see now J.M.Kearns (quoted above, n. 1, p. 33).

[3] K.Latte, "Über eine Eigentümlichkeit der römischen Gottesvorstellung", *ARW* 24 (1926): 244-258.

[4] K.E.Ingvarsson, "*Ingens* dans la poésie et chez Tacite", *Eranos* 47 (1949): 66-70.

quantity. Rather, such adjectives serve to verbalize the impact of the text on the listener. Consider Homer's description of fear (*Odyssey* ε 297): "Then were the knees of Odysseus loosened and the heart within him melted"[1] καὶ τότ' 'Οδυσσῆος λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ. Livius, on the other hand, adopts a language of inward experience rather than of vision (*frg.* 16 Morel = 30 Blänsdorf): "So then at length went cold with fright the heart within Ulysses" *igitur demum Ulixi cor frixit prae pavore.*

"Romanization"

As a rule, what is alien to Roman religious feeling is subject to change: Patroclus is not allowed to be "equal to the gods" (θεόφιν μήστωρ ἀτάλαντος, *Odyss.* γ 110); he is simply "the very best, the very first of men—Patroclus" *uir summus adprimus Patroclus* (*frg.* 10 Morel = 10 Blänsdorf). Here the collision between the social codes is the obvious reason for a considerable deviation from the model.

Similarly, Livius brings the Homeric gods closer to his readers by Romanizing their names. The place of the Muse, for example, is taken by Camena,[2] one of the nymphs of a sacred source outside the *Porta Capena.* The name is appropriately chosen, because it sounds almost like *carmen,* and both the Muses and Camenae play a prophetic role. The substitution of Moira by the Roman deity *Morta* (*frg.* 11 Morel = 23 Blänsdorf) seems to meet even modern etymological standards;[3] the above-mentioned choice of *insece* for ἔννεπε represents a parallel case. Such lucky discoveries are the results of the poet's effort to penetrate into the very essence of the two languages he mastered. His quick ear led him to the point of establishing etymological equivalents which would be rediscovered only by modern scholarship. Consider the amount of creativity required to pick up an isolated third-rate figure of ancient Roman religion and integrate it into the fully developed theological system of Homeric epic. Thus, while re-activating correct etymologies, the early Roman poets are even contributing to the self-knowledge of ancient Roman society. In this regard, progress (i.e. the introduction of literary epic) turns out to shed new light even on native Roman traditions.

---

[1] Translation: Homer, The Odyssey, translated by A. T. Murray, rev. by G. E. Dimock (Cambridge, Mass. (1919), 2nd ed. 1995).

[2] J.H.Waszink, "Camena", *C&M* 17 (1956): 139-148.

[3] G.Ruhbach, "Morta", in: *KlP,* vol. 3 (Stuttgart, 1969): 1431.

Although the borderline between "discovery" and "invention" of one's own past is often indiscernible, it remains noteworthy that Livius set the tone even for this basic double function of Roman epic, i.e. to establish a new identity while rediscovering an old one. Likewise, the magic of sounds and etymologies would remain typical of old Latin poetry and would survive even longer.

Scholar and Poet

Let us now turn to innovative aspects of Livius' activity! He shows his Hellenistic training by softening or varying the rigidity of Homer's formulaic expressions.[1] Unlike Homer, he knows and uses the term *Graecia* (*frg.* 13 Morel = 11 Blänsdorf) and mentions the mother of the Muses (Μνημοσύνη), whom he calls *Moneta.* He makes Ulysses look more civilized by equipping him with a handkerchief (*noegeum*) to wipe off his tears (*frg.* 19 Morel = 17 Blänsdorf). The metamorphosis of Ulysses' companions from animals into humans is deprived of its fairy-tale atmosphere and described in a sober style (*frg.* 27 Morel = 25 Blänsdorf). No matter whether he used scholarly commentaries on Homer or not,[2] he was a critical reader unable to conceal his training in rhetoric and dialectics. His rendering of πολύτροπος (*uersutus*) interprets Ulysses' many wanderings in terms of character (*uersutus*, "cunning").[3] This confirms Livius' tendency to replace graphic elements with psychological qualities. In other instances it is clear that Livius had knowledge of rationalistic objections to Homer's narrative and tried to "improve" his predecessor. For example, Homer's Nausicaa had Ulysses wait in the grove of Athena until she reached her father's home (*Odyssey* ζ 295-296). But how could Ulysses know when she arrived? Livius tries to solve the problem by assuming that Ulysses waited at an (elevated) place from which he could see the palace of Alcinous (fr. 18 Morel = 15 Blänsdorf):

---

[1] K.Büchner (quoted above, n. 1, p. 33): esp. 52; 58-61; 65.

[2] G.Broccia, "Ricerche su Livio Andronico epico" (Padova, 1974) denies Livius' knowledge of pre-Aristarchean scholia on Homer; but it is evident that Livius read his Homer through the eyes of his own age and that he was brought up in the tradition of Hellenistic schools.

[3] Cf. already Plato, *Hipp. min.* 364 e-365 c (πολύτροπος = ψευδής); cf. Mariotti (quoted above, n. 1, p. 33): 35; G.Pasquali, *Stravaganze quarte e supreme* (Venezia, 1951): 35-38 (*uersutus* ~ "versatile"); according to H.Fränkel, "Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen", *Hermes* 67 (1932) 306, Livius (in *frg.* 22 Morel = 20 Blänsdorf) did not translate Homer, but the Scholion *Odyssey* θ 378-379.

ibi manens sedeto donicum uidebis
me carpento uehentem domum uenisse.[1]

It is surprising to find in an "early" poet so much intellectual effort. The importance of this fact becomes even more evident when we take into account the situation of authors in the Hellenistic period and especially at Rome.

This leads us to the social background of Livius' activity. In all probability, Andronicus came to Rome as a prisoner and slave (perhaps of a Livius Salinator) after the conquest of Tarentum in 272 B.C. That city, which was also the home of Archytas the mathematician and of Leonidas the epigrammatist, was famous for its prosperous trade, its blossoming arts and crafts, and even more for its great theatrical tradition. After the First Punic War, which brought Rome into contact with Greek culture in Sicily, Livius was charged by the *aediles curules* with performing in Rome the first literary drama written in Latin, during the *ludi Romani* in 240 B.C., traditionally the birthday of Roman literature. Much later, in 207 B.C., after the occurrence of fatal prodigies, the *decemuiri sacris faciundis* ordered him to write a hymn of expiation, to be sung by a choir of maidens. Fortunately, after this performance the evil seemed to have been banished, and, in honour of Livius, the temple of Minerva on the Aventine was given to the *collegium scribarum histrionumque* (Festus, p. 446 Lindsay). This was an unusual success, all the more as, at that time, writers were not numerous. Moreover, they were not Roman citizens but clients who needed the protection of mighty patrons. Andronicus was the first to win public recognition for literary activity. Thanks to his Hellenistic education, he was both a scholar and a poet, *philologus*[2] and *poeta.*

The Teacher as Poet and the Poet as Teacher

In all probability, Livius earned his living as a private teacher, a tutor to the sons of a noble family.[3] The lack of good Latin textbooks or readers might have encouraged him to write his *Odusia.* The fact that

---

[1] K.Büchner, *Römische Literaturgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1957): 40 suggests that in Homer the place where Ulysses waited was halfway and that Ulysses had to wait as much time as he had walked.

[2] Suetonius, *De Grammaticis* 1.

[3] I agree with Leo (quoted above, n. 1, p. 33): 55-57, and Mariotti (quoted ibid.): 21- 22, against E.Fraenkel, "Livius", *RE,* Suppl. 5. 601.

a book was written for some practical purpose does not necessarily detract from its quality, and we should, therefore, not be ashamed of admitting that the first Latin epic was written for pupils. Livius could have justly claimed that his illustrious model had served the same purpose for centuries.

Why did he choose the *Odyssey*? During the Hellenistic period, this epic was considered a "beautiful mirror of human life".[1] Moreover, philosophical teachers exploited it to convey to their students a religious outlook, which seemed to recommend a life guided by *sapientia* and *uirtus*. It was not mere chance that the protagonist of the first Latin epic was not Achilles but an enduring hero like Ulysses. In addition, the recent naval victories won by the Romans may have even nurtured an interest in the adventures of a great sailor. Last but not least, Italy was the place of action of many scenes of the *Odyssey*. Thus the *Odusia* was justified as a reflective and, to some degree, instructive piece of literature and, above all, as a part of a new Italo-Roman identity.

Although the *Odusia* was an important achievement for its time, we should not pass over in silence what Livius Andronicus did not yet achieve:

1. The *Odusia* was an adaptation of a Greek poem; Naevius would be the first to treat a Roman subject in epic.
2. The typically Roman interaction (or more or less peaceful co-existence) of the spheres of myth and "modern" history would first appear in Naevius.
3. It was left to Ennius to Latinize the Greek hexameter.[2]
4. Homer's epithets would be Latinized later by Naevius and Ennius.
5. Virgil would be the first to succeed in creating an epic which would meet high artistic standards both in its details and in its overall structure.
6. The *Odusia* does not contain explicit philosophical teaching, which will be found in Roman epic from Ennius onward.

---

[1] Alcidamas apud Aristot., *Rhet.* 1406 b: καλὸν κάτοπτρον τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου βίου.

[2] M.Lenchantin De Gubernatis believed that Livius Andronicus had written hexameters (p. 20 of his edition; quoted above, n. 1, p. 33). Much more convincingly, F.Leo (*Plautinische Forschungen* [quoted above, n. 4, p. 37]: 60. 2) supposed that at a later date a hexametric adaptation of the *Odusia* was made.

Epilogue: Livius Andronicus is considered the inventor of translation as an art.[1] Literature, initially, was something foreign to the Romans, something to be conquered or learnt. Unlike other peoples of the Mediterranean world, they resisted the all-pervading influence of the Greek language and created a literature in their native tongue. Hence, Greek literature, rhetoric, and philosophy served as tools for the discovery and development of their own Roman identity.

Translation, however, is too narrow a term to describe the activity of Livius Andronicus. Rather, his was a first discovery of the potentialities of Latin as a poetic language; the result was the first authoritative literary utterance of the genius of Latin. It is intriguing to observe, in Livius' mind as well as in the minds of his readers, different types of "intertextuality": interactions between the linguistic codes of Homeric Greek and early Latin, between the generic codes of Greek epic and Roman ritual, Greek rhetoric and Roman senatorial oratory, archaic myth and philosophical enlightenment (including even philological criticism), the late archaic social code of the *Odyssey*, the modern education of the author, and the mentality of his Roman audience, which in some respects was even more archaic than the late Homeric society. Under these circumstances, we should expect anything but a "translator's" philological correctness. Instead, we should be ready to witness a fascinating interplay of different intellectual, emotional, religious, philosophical, and social patterns, which in each single fragment overlap in different ways. All of this reflects the captivating process of the creation of a poetic language.

---

[1] It is from this point of view that his activity has been assessed by Leo and Mariotti (both quoted above, n. 1, p. 33); cf. also A.Ronconi, "Sulla tecnica delle antiche traduzioni latine da Omero", *SIFC* 34 (1962) 5-20. Translations of religious texts and translations of professional manuals for practical aims are a totally different genre; they were read for their content rather than for their literary qualities. In religious texts, literal translation was a consequence of the holiness of the text; the importance of literal translation was, therefore, enhanced by Christianity. When, during the Renaissance, the classical authors began to replace the Scriptures to some degree, the principle of literal translation was often applied to them. The results were sometimes beneficial, often devastating. On "literary translation" as a type of "secondary literary genre": E.Neu, "Übersetzung—Möglichkeiten und Grenzen", *Humanistische Bildung* 9 (1985): 55-92; cf. also G.Mounin, *Die Übersetzung. Geschichte, Theorieanwendung* (München, 1967); on the problem of translation in general and Livius Andronicus in particular: A.Seele, *Römische Übersetzer. Nöte, Freiheiten, Absichten. Verfahren des literarischen Übersetzens in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Darmstadt, 1995). The author discusses the so-called shortcomings of Latin as compared to Greek; her main subject are literary translations written by pagan authors. She discusses classical theories of translation (as found in Terence, Cicero, Horace, Quintilian, Jerome).

Its strong impact on the reader is the result of the interferences of different codes and patterns described above. What is important is not to single out individual rhetorical patterns or epic traditions but to observe how they cooperate to inform, delight, and move the reader. The lasting success of many of Livius' discoveries testifies to the linguistic competence, the musical ear, and the poetic instinct of this pioneer of Latin epic.

CHAPTER THREE

NAEVIUS

Dispositio. *The Clash of Myth and History*

Double Identity: Campanian and Roman

After Livius Andronicus, Naevius[1] was the second Latin epic poet. He was of "Campanian" origin (Gellius 1. 20. 14), which, according to Latin usage, means that he was from Capua,[2] a city allegedly founded by Romulus, and his thoughts and feelings were those of a Roman, not without a large admixture of Campanian pride. Capua in his day was almost as important economically as Rome and Carthage and its citizens were fully aware of this (though it was not until the Second Punic War that it abandoned Rome). Naevius himself tells us (Varro apud Gell. 17. 21. 45) that he actively participated in the First Punic War. The experience of that great historical conflict led to the birth of the *Bellum Poenicum*, the first Roman national epic. Similarly, Ennius would write his *Annales* after the Second Punic War and Virgil his *Aeneid* after the Civil Wars.

In 235 B.C., only five years after the first performance of a Latin play by Livius Andronicus, Naevius staged a drama of his own. Soon he became the greatest comic playwright, unsurpassed until Plautus. He did not restrain his sharp tongue even when speaking of the noblest families. Although he did not mention anyone by name, he unequivocally alluded to a rather unheroic moment in the life of the young Scipio (*Com.* 108-110 R), and his quarrel with the Metelli (ps.-Ascon., *Ad Cic. Verr.* 1. 29), formerly dismissed as fiction,[3] is accepted today as having some basis in fact. In addition, when Plautus (*Mil.*

---

[1] All translations quoted in this chapter are adapted from: E.H.Warmington, Remains of Old Latin, Vol.2 (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1936).

[2] H.T.Rowell, "The 'Campanian' Origin of Cn.Naevius and its Literary Attestation", *MAAR* 19 (1949): 17-34.

[3] G.Wissowa, "Naevius und die Meteller", in: *Genethliakon für C.Robert* (Berlin, 1910): 51-63. For a criticism of the biographical tradition: H.B. Mattingly, "Naevius and the Metelli", *Historia* 9 (1960): 414-439 (with bibl.); see also T.Frank, "Naevius and Free Speech", *AJPh* 48 (1927): 105-120; H.D. Jocelyn, "The Poet Cn. Naevius, P. Cornelius Scipio, and Q. Caecilius Metellus", *Antichthon* 3 (1969): 32-47.

210-212) speaks of a poet sitting in jail, his chin resting meditatively on his hand and forearm, as if on a column, in all likelihood we are meant to see an allusion to Naevius who, according to Varro (apud Gell. 3. 3. 15) wrote two plays containing excusatory passages while in prison. The seeming conventionality of the story is not, in itself, proof against its veracity; for, if the lives of dissident authors of all periods are similar, this is not necessarily the fault of their biographers. On the other hand, since it is hard to imagine a jolly prison inspiring an author to write comedies, it is reasonable to assume that Varro combined two independent pieces of evidence, the information that Naevius had been in prison and the extant excusatory passages in two comedies. That Naevius left the city because certain members of the nobility hated him sounds believable, though we are not allowed to project onto the poet the fate of famous exiles of later times. He died in Utica some time after 204 B.C.[1]

Between Epic and Drama

Naevius' dramas are mentioned here only as far as they are relevant to the *Bellum Poenicum.* First of all, his tragedies naturalized Greek myths at Rome, particularly—and not accidentally—the Trojan legends; King Pyrrhus of Epirus, for example, would fight against Rome as if against a new Troy. Similarly later, in the *Bellum Poenicum,* the events of contemporary history would be seen against the background of Rome's Trojan origins. The dramas, therefore, seem to have paved the way for Naevius' s epic which linked Roman history to its mythical roots.

On the other hand, in the titles of the plays there are several female names: *Danae, Hesione, Iphigenia.* Far from dwelling uniquely on male heroism, Naevius the tragedian was not blind to the sufferings of women, and even in the *Bellum Poenicum* he would reveal the emotions of the women leaving Troy (*Frg.* 4 Morel = 5 Blänsdorf).

In additon to myth, Naevius discovered Roman history as a subject for his dramas. He was the first to write serious historical drama at Rome, the so-called *praetexta.* Though (as early as Aeschylus' *Persae*) there had been predecessors in classical Greek and Hellenistic drama, it is important to keep in mind that Naevius, before writing the *Bellum*

[1] Probably the latest date of a performance, cf. Varro apud Cic., *Brut.* 60; Jerome, *Chron.* 145th Olympiad, ad annum 201 B.C.

Poenicum, had shaped contemporary history into an artistic form quite different from mere chronicle.

An important aspect of Naevius' theatre is his linguistic creativity. We have to take into account the wide range of expression found in his comedies in order to appreciate the fact that the striking simplicity of many passages in the *Bellum Poenicum* is due not to incapacity, but to discipline.

Between Myth and History

Naevius turned to epic in his old age (we should not dismiss Cicero, *Cato* 14. 50),[1] or at least he put the final touches on that national poem of which he had been thinking for many years. The title *Bellum Poenicum*, which the poet himself gave to the work, stresses its contemporary character. His insistence on his having been an eyewitness reminds us of Polybius; yet the fact that a piece of poetry was the result of that experience shows how deeply moving those events were.

In order to do justice to the importance of his subject, Naevius is not content to write a mere chronicle, but rather incorporates ætiological myth as a foil for contemporary history: The legends of Troy's fall and the birth of Rome are united by Aeneas' person. Since Naevius did not mention the events between the foundation of Rome and the First Punic War, his use of the ætiological legend is not the result of a simple striving for completeness; after all, the work is tellingly not called *Annales*, but *Bellum Poenicum*.

What are the links between legend and history in Naevius' epic on the levels of form and content? How did the poet bridge the gap between these parts? What was the function of the legendary narrative within the whole of the work?

First on form. It would be easy to assume that Naevius told events continuously from the fall of Troy to the end of the First Punic War. This solution, which on first glance has the advantage of simplicity, for a long time had been the only answer to the question of form and even today has its supporters.[2] What is more, this view chimed with

---

1 W.Beare, "The Date of the Bellum Punicum", *CR* 63 (1949): 48.

2 K.Büchner, "Der Anfang des *Bellum Poenicum* des Naevius", in: K.Büchner, *Humanitas Romana* (Heidelberg, 1957): 13-34; W.Richter, "Das Epos des Cn.Naevius. Probleme der dichterischen Form", *NGG* (1960) 3: 40-66. Even the important and penetrating observations of R.Häussler do not convince me on this point: *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer, Vol. 1: Von Homer bis Vergil* (Heidelberg, 1976): 121-210.

the romantic idea of a primitive Naevius and thus ignored his mastery of dramatic form and style. Yet, while a modern viewer, in retrospect, tends to notice, above all, the primitive and archaic features in Naevius, the poet himself would have seen his achievement in quite a different light. It must have been his main concern to create a modern Roman counterpart to Greek culture which, after the conquests of Southern Italy and Sicily, had become more and more a challenge to the Romans.

On closer inspection, the assumption that there was a simple sequence from legendary to contemporary history meets with practical difficulties. First, it remains obscure how Naevius bridged the chronological gap between Rome's foundation and the beginning of the First Punic War. Second, because an event of the year 263 B.C. is attested for Book 1 (*Frg.* 32 Morel = 3 Blänsdorf), those who suppose a strictly chronological order are compelled to change the transmitted book number in this fragment, a step which should be taken only as a last resort, since it undermines the only foundations upon which we can build. Rather, the manuscripts which ascribe events of the First Punic War to Book 1 suggest that Naevius inserted the foundation legend as an excursus,[1] and on this assumption we are able to make sense of the ancient book numbers. The vexing problem of the chronological gap between legendary and contemporary history disappears as we begin to see what might have been the structural idea of Naevius' poem. It is open to debate whether the legendary panel was inserted as an "archæology" in the style of historical monographs or, in the vein of epic, as an Odyssean story within the story or as an ecphrasis. In the latter case the sculptural decoration of the temple of Zeus in Agrigentum[2] could have served as a starting point; there one could see the giants mentioned by Naevius as well as scenes from the Trojan War, a suitable context for the Aeneas story. Moreover, a description which imperceptibly turned into a narrative was not unusual in Hellenistic poetry; consider Catullus, *Carm.* 64. But even those who prefer to assign Naevius' giants to

---

[1] W.(= L.) Strzelecki, *De Naeviano "Belli Punici" carmine quaestiones selectae* (Kraków, 1935).

[2] H.Fränkel, "Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen II", *Hermes* 70 (1935): 59-72. (without the assumption of an insertion); Strzelecki (1935): 10; A.Klotz, "Zu Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum*", *RhM* 87 (1938): 190-192; for the archaeological scholarship on the temple, H.T.Rowell, "The Original Form of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*", *AJPh* 68 (1947): 21-46, esp. 34.

the description of a shield[1] or of a ship's decoration[2] prove nothing against the assumption of an insertion independent of the giants fragment.

In the first part of Book 1, the events of the years 264-262 B.C. had been related, very probably with the episode beginning after the storming of Agrigentum. At that moment, which marks an important pause in the war,[3] it was possible to realize the dimensions of the conflict, and Naevius could feel at liberty to reflect on the past events.

From considerations of form we turn to problems of content. Before discussing more controversial questions, let us recall what we know: Anchises has been given prophetic books by Venus (13 a, cf. 12 and 28 Morel = 4, cf. 9 and 32 Blänsdorf), and he and Aeneas leave Troy accompanied by their wives (4 Morel = 5 Blänsdorf) and their comrades (5 Morel = 5 Blänsdorf). Perhaps when Aeneas gets close to the Italian coast (17 and 18 Morel = 12 and 11 Blänsdorf), during a sea storm, there is a dialogue between Venus and Jupiter (13 Morel = 14 Blänsdorf), and Aeneas comforts his companions (16 Morel = 13 Blänsdorf).

The 2nd Book started with an assembly of the gods. Did it contain an encounter between Aeneas and Dido (6; 10; 23 Morel =17; 19; 20 Blänsdorf)? Three answers are possible:

1. Aeneas did not come to Carthage.[4] If so, it becomes difficult to fit the mention of Anna and Dido (6 Morel = 17 Blänsdorf) into the text. On the other hand, this solution has the advantage of avoiding a "detour" in the 1st Book.

2. Aeneas went to Africa and met Dido without falling in love with her.[5] This theory, however, is improbable since such a behaviour runs against all the conventions of epic literature.

3. There was an encounter and a love affair between Aeneas and Dido in Naevius.[6] This conclusion, which has found almost

---

1 E.Fraenkel, "The Giants in the Poem of Naevius", *JRS* 44 (1954): 14-17 (following Niebuhr).

2 K.Büchner (the ship of Aeneas); Merula (the ship of Duilius): *Q. Enni... Annalium libri XIIX* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1595): CCCCX.

3 H.Haffter, Review of Strzelecki (quoted above, n. 1, p. 48), *DLZ* 58 (1937): 659-663, esp.663.

4 T.B.De Graff; "Dido—Tota Vergiliana", *CW* 43 (1948/50): 147-151.

5 V.Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms. Untersuchungen zum Bellum Poenicum und zur Aeneis* (Heidelberg, 1963 = *Gymnasium*, Suppl. 3).

6 The originality of Virgil's invention (which is attested in our sources) is not affected by this supposition. Invention refers to the plot rather than to mere facts.

unanimous acceptance,[1] is suggested, among other reasons, by the fact that Dido in the *Aeneid* refers to the Punic Wars in her curse as she mentions the future avenger (4. 625); this motif, which does not have an immediate structural importance to the *Aeneid*, would be entirely relevant to the structure of Naevius' epic, where the avenger would be Hamilcar. There is much to be said in favour of this motif having been invented for the older epic, for there it would establish an immediate connection between the framing historical subject matter and the legendary insertion. Thus Naevius seems to anticipate a practice of later Roman historians who projected problems of their own times onto former ages.

Book 3 contained the story of the foundation of Rome. Naevius considered Romulus the grandson of Aeneas (25); similarly in Ennius Ilia was a daughter of Aeneas.

Books 4-7 treated further events of the war after 261 B.C., each book comprising about five years. The work had approximately four to five thousand lines. (The subdivision into books was not made by the poet himself but by the philologist Octavius Lampadio). Hence, the *Bellum Poenicum* was about the same length as Apollonius' *Argonautica*, in accordance with the norm propounded by Aristotle (*Poet.* 24. 1459 b 20-22) for a modern epic poem, which equals the length of a tragic trilogy.[2]

The presence of a long excursus is not surprising if we think of Hellenistic structural principles as reflected in Moschus' *Europa* and Catullus' *Carmen* 64. Hellenistic poets had established a relationship of meaning between a framing narrative and an insertion, and it would be strange if Naevius, who in his dramatic œuvre followed Hellenistic models, had failed to do so in his epic.

---

[1] In favour of a love affair between Aeneas and Dido: H.Oppermann, "Dido bei Naevius", *RhM* 88 (1939): 206-214. This view is categorically contradicted by D.C.Feeney, *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford, 1991): 109: "It is virtually impossible that Naevius described a failed love affair between Aeneas and Dido, for the universal testimony to Virgil's invention of the story is hardly to be circumvented." So he is compelled to surmise that in Naevius the conflict between Trojans and Carthagians arose for other reasons, and that Jupiter's care in 1. 297-300 could "prevent a repetition of what had happened in Naevius". One would like to know, what those "other reasons" were. They must have been grievous enough to provoke Dido's curse. A failed love affair is an excellent explanation for deep hatred (the ancients often recurred to love stories to explain historical conflicts: Herodotus, 1. 1-4). Any other serious motive—political treason on the part of Aeneas—would have been even more detrimental to Aeneas' (and Rome's) moral reputation.

[2] S.Mariotti, *Il Bellum Poenicum e l'arte di Nevio. Saggio con edizione dei frammenti* (Rome, 1955).

As for the function of the excursus, three possibilities have been considered. First, did Naevius wish to give a parallel account of the foundation legends of Rome and Carthage? This old theory[1] has been abandoned nowadays because in Naevius' epic there was no space for the treatment of the Carthaginian legend on a scale similar to that of the Roman. Undeniably, however, there had been a brief mention of it (*Frg.* 6 Morel = 17 Blänsdorf).

Or, second, did Naevius want to write a Roman ætiology?[2] This is largely correct, though the excursus also contained foundation legends of other Italian places, or at least passing references to them.

Or, third, did the excursus in addition give a mythical foundation to the conflict between Rome and Carthage?[3] This thesis is the most appealing of all; it could be accepted if there were a tragic encounter between Aeneas and Dido, as we have tried to show above.

Generic Problems: Between Epic and History

For contemporary history Naevius relied on his own memory and, perhaps, on an unknown Latin chronicler[4] who could not have been Fabius Pictor. It was to be expected that Naevius should take into account the Carthaginian view (as represented by Philinus), but there is little evidence for this. Timaeus of Tauromenium,[5] along with oral traditions, is thought to have been a source for foundation legends.

We will come back to the literary influence of historiographical techniques. As for poetic traditions, we have to mention Homer and Hellenistic epic. Naevius Latinizes some Homeric epithets, adopts Hesiod's idea of the Muses, and writes an historical monograph as Choerilus of Samos had done, who in a personal proem gave an account of his choice of the Persian Wars as his subject. A double herm showing portraits of a Greek and a Roman has been thought to represent Choerilus and Naevius.[6] The idea of combining an "Iliad"

---

1 F.Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur, Vol. 1* (Berlin, 1913 = repr. Darmstadt, 1967).

2 Mariotti, ibid. 39-40; 19-20.

3 B.G.Niebuhr, *Vorträge über römische Geschichte*, gesammelt von M.Isler (Berlin, 1846): 17; Büchner (quoted above, n. 2, p. 47): 29.

4 F.Bömer, "Naevius und Fabius Pictor", *SO* 29 (1952): 34-53; F.Altheim, "Naevius und die Annalistik", in: *Festschrift J.Friedrich* (Heidelberg, 1959): 1-34.

5 F.Noack, "Die erste Aeneis Vergils", *Hermes* 27 (1992): 437, n.1.

6 G.Hafner, "Cn. Naevius und M. Claudius Marcellus 2", *MDAI (R)* 75 (1968): 64-73.

and an "Odyssey" in a short epic links Naevius to Apollonius Rhodius,[1] as do his brevity and his interest in ætiology. If there were a love story, this would be a further parallel; Naevius, though, must have subordinated such Alexandrian elements to his national theme. It had been a daring enterprise to write an epic as an historical monograph with mythical background; the result was an epic poem *sui generis* which did not find immediate successors.

The Latin tradition established by Livius Andronicus was a further challenge. Although he composed in the Saturnian metre and also followed Livius' tendency to "Romanize" elements of Greek epic style, Naevius was an innovator: he chose Roman subject matter and used myth to illustrate history and history myth each other (although the combination of foundation legend and contemporary history is to be found in historiographers such as Ctesias, Hellanicus, and, probably later than Naevius, Fabius Pictor). There even seem to be some parallels between Naevius and the "anti-rhetorical" rhetoric of the *laudatio funebris*.[2] Further Latin influences will be mentioned in connection with style.[3]

Between Literary Craftsmanship and Roman Severity

The passage on the *Gigantes* and *Atlantes* shows that Naevius was well aware of the epic tradition of ecphrasis, which began with Homer's description of Achilles' shield and was considerably developed in Hellenistic times. The idea of introducing an "archæology" in the 1st Book in the form of an excursus shortly after the beginning of the work goes back to the tradition of historical "monographs" as established by Thucydides. However, in attributing mythical causes to the events of contemporary history, Naevius also has something in common with Herodotus[4] before him and Virgil after him, and if he did in fact recount the Dido episode, he is the missing link between these two authors. These are signs of the influence of the literary genre of historiography. However, when Naevius stresses that he was

---

[1] For Apollonius in Naevius see R.Häussler (quoted above, n. 2, p. 47): 99-106.

[2] M.Durry (ed.), *Eloge funèbre d'une matrone romaine* (Paris, 1950): esp. pp. XXXV-XLIII ("Anti-Kunstprosa").

[3] For the style of triumphal inscriptions, E.Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin, 1922): 234-240 (= pp. 226-231 of the Italian edition by F.Munari (Firenze, 1960), with supplements (pp. 428-430).

[4] W.Richter (quoted above, n. 2, p. 47): 48.

an eye-witness, as Polybius does, this is to be taken as a fact, not a literary device[1] inherited from historians.

Naevius contributed greatly to the development of the style of Latin epic. His preference for the present as a narrative tense paved the way for later epic poets. The fragments also exhibit a device typical of later poetic syntax, the avoidance of subordination by simply juxtaposing verbs in different tenses; consider *Fragments* 3 and 24 Morel = 25 and 26 Blänsdorf.

In the Saturnian verse[2] of Naevius there is a chiastic interrelation between the number of words and the number of syllables in the first and the second half of the line. If we designate each word by "W" and the number of syllables it contains by an Arabic number, we get the following scheme: **W&W&W&/&W&W 2&2&3&/&3&3**

It is worthwhile to dwell a little longer on the structure of individual lines since word-architecture was to become a typical feature of Latin poetry. Let us first consider "closed" forms. The very first fragment[3] exhibits a precise axial symmetry: *Nouem Iouis concordes filiae sorores* (*Frg.* 1 Morel = 1 Blänsdorf). The central *concordes*, which by its meaning stresses harmony, is encased within two frames, *Iouis... filiae* and *nouem... ... sorores*. The first, third, and fifth words of the line are related by grammar and assonance (the only vowels are *o* and *e*); by contrast, the second and the fourth words contain the vowel *i*. The axial symmetry of the word-architecture is reminiscent of the first line of Livius Andronicus (*uirum mihi Camena insece uersutum*), but the sounds are treated even more subtly by Naevius. In other lines the structure is marked by alliteration: *magnae metus tumultus pectora possidit* (*Frg.* 53 Morel = 59 Blänsdorf). The central term *tumultus* is surrounded by two pairs of words linked by alliteration. Two different structural principles interact in *Frg.* 45 Morel = 42 Blänsdorf: *superbiter contemptim conterit legiones*. If we look at the parts of speech, the line is divided into halves, but the alliteration unites the two central words. Of this line Eduard Fraenkel said that for centuries no Greek had been able to put such power into only four words.[4]

---

1 Differently, W.Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius* (Hildesheim, 1968): 25.

2 For a full account of Livian metrics: M.Barchiesi, *Nevio epico. Storia, interpretazione, edizione critica* (Padova, 1962): 310-327 (with bibliography).

3 It is not certain that *Frg.* 1 was the first line of the epic; if it were, the unusual luxury of invoking all nine Muses would chime with Naevius' Campanian arrogance.

4 *RE*, Suppl. 6 (1935): 638.

On the other hand, there are parallel structures. For example, the sequence adjective - noun - adjective - noun used by Andronicus in *Frg.* 4 Morel = 5 Blänsdorf (*argenteo pollubro, aureo eclutro*) also appears in Naevius: *ferunt pulchras creterras, aureas lepistas* (*Frg.* 6 Morel = 17 Blänsdorf); *bicorpores Gigantes magnique Atlantes* (*Frg.* 19 Morel = 8 Blänsdorf). There is also assonance between the middle and the end of a line: *onerariae onustae stabant in flustris* (*Frg.* 46 Morel = 48 Blänsdorf). While in the quoted examples we observed internal rhyme, the following two lines are linked by rhyming central verbs: *seseque ei perire mavolunt ibidem, quam cum stupro redire ad suos popularis* (*Frg.* 42 Morel = 50 Blänsdorf).

Let us now turn to "open" forms: *amborum uxores / noctu Troiad exibant capitibus opertis, / flentes ambae, abeuntes lacrimis cum multis* (*Frg.* 4 Morel = 5 Blänsdorf). Unlike the preceding fragments, the thought does not end with the line (*amborum uxores*), but in the centre of the following verse (*noctu Troiad exibant*). In what might be called "early Latin appendage style", there follow several "afterthoughts", sometimes additions of an adverbial character (*capitibus opertis; lacrimis cum multis*), sometimes present participles (*flentes ambae, abeuntes*), an especially expressive verbal form, the suggestivity of which will be exploited by later poets on a larger scale (Ennius, *Ann.* 103 Vahlen[1] = 498 Skutsch).[2] Note also how the form suits the content: the lingering sentence structure with its series of appendages reflects the unwillingness of the women to leave Troy.[3] The thought of the main verb (*exibant*) is picked up towards the end of the sentence by the participle (*abeuntes*); this might be considered an element of consistency which counterbalances the looseness of the structure. Hence, there is interaction between two structural principles, architectural symmetry of closed forms on the one hand and expressive suggestivity of open forms on the other. Lapidary brevity and strong emotions, far from being mutually exclusive, are merely the two poles of a style which has to be viewed as a whole. Though ponderous, Naevius' lines are clearly structured, and for all their architectural qualities they are not devoid of life. We can understand Cicero's comparing the art of Naevius to the severe sculptural style of Myron (Cicero, *Brutus* 75).

---

[1] *Maerentes flentes lacrimantes commiserantes* (Vahlen relies on the ancient grammarians). Skutsch's reading is based on the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*: *flentes plorantes lacrumantes obtestantes.*

[2] See below, our chapter X.

[3] H.Fränkel compared this style with that of the *Heliand*: "Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen, II", *Hermes* 70 (1935): 59.

It is worthwhile to dwell a little longer on the problem of stylistic levels in Naevius. For Latin language and style Naevius could draw mainly on two sources radically different from each other, the poetic medium created by Livius Andronicus for his mythological epic and the matter-of-fact Latin of politics and warfare. His very subject matter compelled him to combine these elements. Facts are related in a plain and simple style: "Manius[1] Valerius the consul leads a part of his army on an expedition" *Manius Valerius consul partem exerciti in expeditionem ducit* (*Frg.* 32 Morel = 3 Blänsdorf), or: "The Roman crosses over to Malta, an island unimpaired; he lays it waste by fire and slaughter, and finishes the affairs of the enemy" *transit Melitam Romanus exercitus, insulam integram urit, populatur, uastat, rem hostium concinnat* (*Frg.* 39 Morel = 37 Blänsdorf).[2]

Through his poetry, Naevius creates something analogous to early triumphal inscriptions. The noble simplicity of his language is also reminiscent of Roman historical paintings; he lets the facts speak for themselves, considering them to be too great to need adornment. The modern notion of 'factographic' style captures the ides correctly, albeit in an ugly word.[3]

Naevius develops the style of Latin epic which had been created by Livius Andronicus. In some of his descriptions of psychological facts the use of alliteration combined with abstract vocabulary (e.g. *metus*) heralds the practice of later poets, who, rather than describing the external signs of emotions, try to convey them by means of abstract nouns and adjectives together with acoustic devices such as alliteration. As early as Livius Andronicus, emotions are not described in physical terms but are located in the heart of the person (Andronicus had written *cor frixit prae pauore* instead of the Homeric "his knees were loosed"). From its very outset, the approach of Roman poets to psychology is emotional rather than physiological. A telling example of the transposition of the drama from the visible stage into the actor's mind is the last scene of the *Aeneid.* There seems to be little external action; all of the drama takes place in Aeneas' heart (from aggression to clemency and, finally, to wrath and vengeance).

---

[1] Warmington (quoted above, n. 1, p. 45) writes "Marcus".

[2] F.Leo called this 'literary chronicle style' (quoted above, n. 1, p. 51: 80) and even E.Fraenkel accepted this term (*RE*, Suppl. 6 [1935]: 638), although he himself had much more appropriately pointed to the style of Roman triumphal inscriptions, cf. n.23, above.

[3] S.A.Osherov, "The *Punic War* of Cn.Naevius" (in Russian), *VMU* 1 (1958): 131-146. Being an eye-witness, Naevius gives his testimony.

Just as Andronicus had done, Naevius often refers to the gods by means of patronymics (*Frgg.* 1; 19; 29 Morel = 1; 8; 22 Blänsdorf), and for an audience which believed that a person's social rank was determind by his birth, the use of patronymics must have added considerably even to the authority of the gods. And although the Hellenization of the Roman Olympus was at that time in full progress,[1] Roman ritual still contributes considerably to the poetic effect of Naevius' epic by enriching the language of *theologia fabulosa* with the resources of *theologia ciuilis*: *Frg.* 36 Morel = 39 Blänsdorf "The praetor comes and takes prosperous auspices" *uirum*[2] *praetor aduenit auspicat auspicium prosperum*; *Frg.* 31 Morel = 35 Blänsdorf "To make the holy tufts, they took twigs and sacred foliage" *scopas atque uerbenas sagmina sumpserunt*; *Frg.* 3 Morel = 25 Blänsdorf "After Anchises had seen a bird within the range of view, hallowed offerings were set in a row on the table of the Household Gods, and he busied himself in sacrificing a beautiful golden victim" *postquam auem aspexit in templo Anchisa, / sacra in mensa penatium ordine ponuntur; / immolabat auream uictimam pulchram.*[3]

With great success Naevius puts the language of Roman religion and Roman law[4] into the service of poetry. In his use of the Saturnian, his preference for parataxis is due to deliberate choice, for the syntax in his comedies is more intricate.

On the other hand, Naevius Latinizes Greek epithets of gods, such as *pollens sagittis* (*Frg.* 30 Morel = 24 Blänsdorf) for ἑκάεργος, or *arquitenens* (*Frg.* 30 Morel = 24 Blänsdorf) for τοξοφόρος. Finally *pulcher* ("flawless"), in addition to its ancient Roman ritual meaning (*Frg.* 3 Morel = 25 Blänsdorf), becomes the equivalent of καλός in a purely æsthetic sense (*Frgg.* 7 and 10 Morel = 31 and 19 Blänsdorf). In fact, the devaluation of the word would be complete as early as the time of Lucilius, who has Apollo refuse to be called by his traditional epithet *pulcher* for fear of the homosexual connotations taken over from Greek.

---

[1] U.Knoche, "Über die Aneignung griechischer Poesie im älteren Rom", *Gymnasium* 65 (1958): 321-340, esp. 335, repr. in: U.Knoche, *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* (Meisenheim, 1986): 62-81, esp. 76; G.Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 2nd ed. (München, 1912): 60-62.

[2] Warmington reads *uerum*.

[3] Feeney (quoted above, n. 1, p. 50): 111-112 rightly points out that Anchises is described as a Roman *decemuir*. Moreover, he stresses the uniqueness of the identification of a city-god (Jupiter) with Zeus.

[4] Cf. M.Barchiesi, *Nevio epico. Storia, interpretazione, editione critica* (Padova, 1962): 413-415.

The variety of Naevius' language is impressive. His epic style is less exuberant and more controlled than the style of his comedies. It was left to Ennius to introduce baroque word-play into epic; this poet might be the target of the peremptory statement on Naevius' epitaph that after Naevius' death people in Rome forgot how to speak Latin. On the whole, the style of the *Bellum Poenicum* is more unified than our textbooks seem to admit.[1]

A Reflective Poet

Although the verse in which the Muses are mentioned need not have been the very first line of Naevius' work, it shows that Ennius was not the first to invoke the Greek Muses. For, it should be remembered that Ennius attacked Naevius not for failing to invoke the Muses, but for falling short of their high standards. Naevius used both *Camenae* and *Musae*[2] and in his wording followed Hesiod (*Theog.* 60 and 76). Unlike Homer who invoked the Muse right away when announcing his subject, Naevius probably adopted a different type of *prooemium* (found in the *Small Iliad*, Apollonius Rhodius, Lucretius, and Virgil). He announced his subject in the first person and invoked the Muses only later when searching for the causes of the conflict. In any case Naevius was a reflective poet.

A Bold Innovator Between Ancient Roman Ideas and Greek Enlightenment

Naevius stresses the role of Anchises as a prophet, the importance of Roman state religion and its rites,[3] justice and scrupulous observance of the will of the gods. Man is, therefore, both part of the *res publica*[4] and part of an historical process; in this respect, Naevius must be considered a precursor of those who later believed in Rome's historical mission. The Scipionic *elogia* (*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 1, 19) also show that for the individual Roman the approval of the many is crucial and that his honour or dishonour depends on how he is

---

[1] For a correct view of the problem see U.Hübner, "Zu Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum*", *Philologus* 116 (1972): 261-276.

[2] I fully agree with the excellent article of J.Latacz, "Zum Musen-Fragment des Naevius", *WJA* n.s. 2 (1976): 119-134.

[3] K.H.Schwarte, "Naevius, Ennius und der Beginn des Ersten Punischen Krieges", *Historia* 21 (1972): 206-223.

[4] E.Burck, "Das Menschenbild im römischen Epos", *Gymnasium* 65 (1958): 121-146.

judged by the group: "And they preferred to die on the very spot rather than return to their compatriots in dishonour" ***seseque ei perire mauolunt ibidem / quam cum stupro redire ad suos popularis*** (*Frg.* 42 Morel = 50 Blänsdorf). It has been surmised that this fragment referred to the behaviour of the Carthaginians;[1] if this is correct, Naevius tries to do justice to his enemies and thus anticipates Virgil's *humanitas.* On the other hand, *populus* usually means the Roman people, all others being *gentes.* In any case it is good to remember that the "beehive" morale was not limited to Rome.

Naevius' epic, however, is not lacking in more modern tones: the sympathetic portrayal of female characters is an important aspect of Naevius' view of mankind, less expected, perhaps, from an "early" poet, but inevitable for a tragedian.

The poets' self-portrayal,[2] even in epic, would become typical of Roman poetry. Naevius replaced the *Camena* of Andronicus with the Nine Muses;[3] the phrase *Naeuius poeta* probably was coined by Naevius himself. Far from being the "silvan prophet", as Ennius caricatures him, Naevius saw himself as a contemporary artist fully aware of modern thought and culture.

A Roman Myron, Eclipsed by Roman Virgil

Roman historical epic was brought to life by the events of a great war; its clear and straightforward language has been dictated by history, and it is meant to make history. The double experience of the soldier and author helps to create an ideal ancestry for Rome and to formulate its future mission. History is ennobled by its foundation in myth, and myth acquires a reality by its connection with history.

As an epic poet Naevius influenced the Roman annalists[4] and, especially for the legendary past, his successor Ennius who would eclipse him. Naevius was studied by scholars; to give an example, the grammarian Octavius Lampadio divided the *Bellum Poenicum* into seven books. But in addition, there was a general audience, whose interest in Naevius is attested by the survival of old texts without book divisions in antiquity. Cicero, whose taste in poetry was determined completely by Ennius, savoured Naevius' archaic and colourful Latin,

---

1 F.Altheim (quoted above, n. 4, p. 51).
2 W.Suerbaum (quoted above, n. 1, p. 53).
3 J.Latacz, "Zum Musen-Fragment des Naevius", *WJA* n.s. 2 (1976): 119-134.
4 W.Strzelecki, "Naevius and Roman Annalists", *RFIC* 91 (1963): 440-458.

compared the *Bellum Poenicum* to Myron's sculptures, and defended it against the assault of Ennius (*Brutus* 19. 76), without ever quoting it, however. With Augustan romanticism interest was rekindled, as can be seen in Varro, an important source for our knowledge of Naevius, though more valuable for the comedies than for the *Bellum Poenicum.* Some fragments came down to us directly through Varro's works, others indirectly through, for example, Gellius and Caesius Bassus. An equal debt is owed to the industry of the lexicographer Verrius Flaccus, whom we know from Festus.

The culmination of the poetic influence of the *Bellum Poenicum* is Virgil's *Aeneid;* consider the combination of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* into an epic poem, the sea storm in Book 1, Jupiter's historical prophecy, the religious role of Anchises, the idea of revealing Rome's mission through prophecy, and perhaps even the derivation of the Punic Wars from the tragedy of Dido. Virgil would reverse the relationship of myth and history, however: with him the main action became mythical, and history appeared in digressions. Virgil's sense of style caused him to abandon the unrestrained colourfulness of Ennius and to emulate rather the dignified sobriety of Naevius. Since Virgil understood Naevius better than any other poet did, it was not inconsistent that the literary influence of the *Bellum Poenicum* both culminated and expired with Virgil.

For the Roman public Virgil replaced both Naevius and Ennius. The commentary on Virgil ascribed to Probus looked ahead to the archaists' interest in Naevius (which, however, would be almost exclusively devoted to the comedies) and drew an historical line from Naevius to Ennius and Virgil (*Ad Ecl.* 6. 31). Interesting fragments and remarks, which may ultimately go back to Donatus,[1] are found in the Virgil Scholia (Servius Danielis) and in Macrobius. Thus, it is owing to Virgil and his great ancient commentators that we are still able to get a glimpse of Naevius' ideas. Lexicographers such as Nonius and grammarians such as Priscian, however, confined their interest to details of language and grammar, and their contribution to our knowledge of the *Bellum Poenicum* can boast quantity rather than quality.

In the Middle Ages Naevius was known only as a writer of comedies. The humanists started to collect and explain his fragments, but

---

[1] H.T.Rowell, "The Scholium on Naevius in Paris. Lat. 7930", *AJPh* 78 (1957): 1-22; idem, "Aelius Donatus and the D Scholia on the *Bellum Punicum* of Naevius", *YCS* 15 (1957): 113-119.

for a long time he was doomed to be an appendix to Ennius. Only with Romanticism is the "primitive and archaic" Naevius exalted at the expense of the "Greekling" Ennius; that epoch initiated modern Naevian scholarship. In our day, scholars using Cicero's judicious assessment as a starting point are beginning to appraise Naevius as an artist and as a bold innovator.

Epilogue: What use did Naevius make of rhetoric and intertextuality? Alliteration, rhyme, and assonance enhance the splendour and dignity of his mythological passages. These stylistic devices had originally been elements of formal prose while others were borrowed from law, religion, and monumental inscriptions. Typical of Naevius' epic diction is a clear and simple straightforwardness which seems to anticipate the nobility of Virgil's style and the later teachings of the author of περὶ ὕψους. The rhetorical doctrine of stylistic levels is possibly behind his different treatment of language and style in his comedies and his epic. What is more important, he did not apply such theories mechanically, but used them to sharpen his poetic genius. Naevius identified himself in a new way with the Latin language. He had a keen sense of what was suited to it and of what was not.[1]

As for intertextuality in the narrower sense of the word, the *Bellum Poenicum* is the antipode of the *Odusia*. The latter followed avowedly a Greek model, the former broke new ground in terms of both form and content. On a higher level of abstraction, however, Naevius established some interferences of diverse cultural and intellectual patterns of great consequence for Latin epic; let us single out here the polarity of myth and history. One highly problematic area of contact and conflict is the divine apparatus as applied to contemporary events and characters. We do not know much about how Naevius solved this æsthetic problem,[2] but he certainly posed it and bequeathed it to his successors. Another problem was the relationship between a mythical past (Aeneas) and modern Roman history. We have seen that the legendary antecedents may have been inserted into

---

[1] This is the message contained in his epitaph, no matter whether it was written by him or by his friends.

[2] D.C.Feeney, *The Gods in Epic*, Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition (Oxford, 1991): 111-112 seems to suspect that Naevius reduced the direct communication between gods and heroes by replacing it with Roman religious practicies such as the consulting of prophetic books or watching the flight of birds, features either unknown or less prominent in Greek epic.

the historical narrative as a story within a story and that there must have been an ætiological link between both spheres. The disparity between myth and history had not yet been felt by Homer; in Naevius the difference was one of time rather than of quality; the discrepancies would come to the fore in Ennius' *Annales*; and Virgil and Lucan would adopt æsthetically satisfactory solutions, the former sticking to mythology, the latter to history.

CHAPTER FOUR

ENNIUS

Elocutio. *A Horse Simile or A Clash of Two Cultures. A Hellenistic Poet in an Archaic Society*

Research concerning archaic thought and language in Rome has only in part kept pace with the study of early Greek thought. Important results have been obtained, especially through research on Lucretius and Sallust, the great heirs of archaic style.[1] Much has been done also for Livius Andronicus, Naevius, and Plautus.[2] As for Ennius, however, first steps have been made by Hanny von Kameke and Wolfgang Röser,[3] but, as Sebastiano Timpanaro[4] rightly observed, these scholars

---

[1] K.Büchner, *Beobachtungen über Vers und Gedankengang bei Lukrez* (Wiesbaden, 1936 = *Hermes Einzelschriften* 1); id., *Der Aufbau von Sallusts Bellum Iugurthinum* (ibid., 1933, 9). The present chapter is largely based on my article "Ein Pferdegleichnis bei Ennius", *Hermes* 97 (1969): 333-345.

[2] E.Fraenkel, "Livius Andronicus", *RE*, Suppl. 5 (1931): 598-607; id., "Naevius", ibid., Suppl. 6 (1935): 622-640; id., *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin, 1922); rev. ed.: *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence, 1960).

[3] H.von Kameke, *Ennius und Homer. Versuch einer Analyse der Annalenfragmente* (diss. Leipzig , 1926): esp. pp. 25-29; W.Röser, *Ennius, Euripides und Homer* (diss. Freiburg, 1939): esp. pp. 39-45; G.Herzog-Hauser, *Ennius und Euripides* (= Commentationes Vindobonenses I, 1935): 47-55; F.Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (Berlin, 1913): 150-211; F.Skutsch, "Ennius", *RE* 5 (1905): 2589-2628. O.Skutsch, *Studia Enniana* (London, 1968); O.Skutsch, and others, *Ennius* (Vandœuvres-Genève, 1972 = *Entretiens Fondation Hardt* 17): 149-195; O.Skutsch, "Book VI of Ennius' *Annals*", *CQ* 81, n.s. 37 (1987): 514-516; W.Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter. Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius* (Hildesheim, 1968 = *Spudasmata* 19). For a more recent assessment: C.J.Classen, "Ennius: Ein Fremder in Rom", *Gymnasium* 99 (1992): 121-145 (pertinent remarks, e.g., on Ennius' relationship to his public, on his adoption of the Greek hexameter [132, n. 22], on his creation of a multifaceted Roman identity, on the intriguing fact that not all of his innovations found acceptance); W.J.Dominik, "From Greece to Rome: Ennius' *Annales*", in: A.J.Boyle (ed.), *Roman Epic* (London, New York, 1993): 37-58 (on Ennius' view of his role as a poet, his attitude to Homer, to Roman history; a remark on the lack of periodic sentence structure [55] might be too confident; see our interpretation); S.Mariotti, *Lezioni su Ennio* (Urbino, 2nd ed. 1991): 65-88 ("Gli *Annali* e l'arte di Ennio": helpful observations on the richness of Ennius' stylistic resources and on his sense of psychology, the intimacy of private life, and education); D.C.Feeney, *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* (Oxford, 1991): 120-128 (on the gods in Ennius); on Ennius' influence: H.Prinzen, *Ennius im Urteil der Antike* (Stuttgart, 1998).

[4] S.Timpanaro, "Forschungsbericht Ennius", *AAHG* 5 (1952): 195-211. Good

have not found due attention from their colleagues. Our intention is not to give a full account of Ennius' thought and style, but to dwell on an individual text.

Ennius, *Annales* 514-518 Vahlen, 2nd ed. (= 535-539 Skutsch)

et tum sicut equus qui de praesepibus fartus
uincla suis magnis animis abrupit et inde
fert sese campi per caerula laetaque prata,
celso pectore saepe iubam quassat simul altam,
spiritus ex anima calida spumas agit albas

And then just as a horse which, full fattened from the stalls, has burst his tether in his high fettle, and away with breast uplifted bears himself over the rich grey-green meadows of the plain; and withal again and again tosses his mane on high; and his breath born of his hot temper flings out white froth...[1]

Homer, *Iliad* 6. 506-511 (= 15. 263-268)

ὡς δ' ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος, ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτνῃ
δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θείῃ πεδίοιο δροαίνων
εἰωθὼς λούεσται ἐϋρρεῖος ποταμοῖο
κυδιόων· ὑψοῦ δὲ κάρη ἔχει, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται
ὤμοις ἀΐσσονται· ὁ δ' ἀγλαΐηφι πεποιθώς,
ῥίμφα ἑ γοῦνα φέρει μετά τ' ἤθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων·

Even as when a stalled horse that has fed his fill at the manger breaks his halter and runs stamping over the plain—being wont to bathe him in the fair-flowing river–and exults; on high does he hold his head, and about his shoulders his mane floats streaming, and as he glories in his splendour, his knees nimbly bear him to the haunts and pastures of mares...[2]

Virgil, *Aeneid* 11. 492-497

qualis ubi abruptis fugit praesepia uinclis
tandem liber equus campoque potitus aperto
aut ille in pastus armentaque tendit equarum
aut adsuetus aquae perfundi flumine noto
emicat arrectisque fremit ceruicibus alte
luxurians, luduntque iubae per colla, per armos.

---

observations, but no general assessment of Ennius' style in H.D.Jocelyn, *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge, 1967).

[1] Translation by E.H.Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967): 195.

[2] Translation adapted from A.T.Murray, *The Iliad of Homer* (London, New York, 1924): 299.

So, when a horse has broken its tether and galloped away from
The paddock, free at last, out on the open plains,
Look how he makes for the meadow where herds of mares are grazing,
Or else he plunges into some well-known stream, as he loves to,
Then leaps out, and throwing his muzzle high, so the mane is tossed
Over neck and shoulders, he whinnies in wild exhilaration![1]

Apollonius Rhodius 3. 1259-1262

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀρήιος ἵππος, ἐελδόμενος πολέμοιο,
σκαρθμῷ ἐπιχρεμέθων κρούει πέδον, αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε
κυδιόων ὀρθοῖσιν ἐπ' οὔασιν αὐχέν' ἀείρει -
τοῖος ἄρ' Αἰσονίδης ἐπαγαίετο κάρτεϊ γυίων.

And as when a warlike steed eager for the fight neighs and beats the ground with his hoof, while rejoicing he lifts his neck on high with ears erect; in such wise did Aeson's son rejoice in the strength of his limbs.[2]

1. *Internal structure of the Ennius passage*

Before we compare Ennius to his predecessors and to Virgil, an analysis of the text's internal structure (which seems not to have been made) will be helpful.

The simile is syntactically incomplete;[3] after line 518 there must have followed a main clause concerning the warrior who was compared to the horse. The context of the simile is unknown, but the first two words give a hint as to the way the simile was related to the preceding text. From all that we know about the use of *tum* in epic poetry[4] we have to conclude that, by this simile, the poet marked within the action a crucial new stage which somehow was more important than all that had gone before. After this initial signal there follows the comparison (*sicut equus*); it is developed in a relative clause (which runs until the end of line 516), and in a parenthesis typical of epic similes (517-518).[5] The continuation of the main

---

[1] Translation by C.D.Lewis, *The Aeneid of Virgil* (Oxford, 1952), reprint Anchor Books (New York, 1953): 274-275.

[2] Translation by R.C.Seaton, *Apollonius Rhodius* (London, New York, 1912): 279.

[3] Ioannes Vahlen rightly omitted the period at the end of the fragment.

[4] *Tum* before a speech: *Ann.* 36 and 175; before a portent, 527, cf. also 77, 156. Instructive is the use of *tum* and *tum uero* in *Aeneid* 12 (see M.N.Wetmore, *Index verborum Vergilianus* [New Haven, 2nd ed. 1930]: s. v.).

[5] Hitherto this parenthesis has not been noticed. For parenthesis in epic simile see my *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion* (Hildesheim, 1964 = Spudasmata 7): 178-182.

clause, which must have followed, is lost. This syntactical analysis of the simile is in harmony with what we know about the structure of similes in Roman poetry. The first conclusion of our inquiry is that Ennius' syntax is less loose than we might have expected.

As for details of rhythm and style, the relative clause consists of three parts of increasing length.[1] At the same time there is an increase in stylistic ornament: in the second part we find expressive word-order (the sentence *uincla... abrupit* is interrupted by *suis magnis animis*). In the third part there is epic periphrasis (*prata campi*),[2] archaic coordination of two adjectives (*caerula laetaque*), alliteration (*campi caerula*), and assonance (*caerula laetaque*). In addition, in the second half of the third line an increase in pure dactyls reflects the swift movement of the horse which has finally gained the open field. The following two lines develop the picture in some detail, as is to be expected in a parenthesis typical of epic similes. These two lines abound in stylistic ornament: line 517 is framed by two almost synonymous adjectives; there is a striking harmony of vowels (*e-e-ae-a-a-a,* 517) and alliteration (*sp-a-sp-a-a,* 518); adverbs and the frequentative verb *quassat* add to the expressiveness of the passage. Twice we find a caesura after the fifth longum (*quassat*; *spumas*) which gives a staccato effect avoided by later epic poets. On the other hand, the first half of line 517, with a complete coincidence of word accent and longum, combined with the "feminine" caesura κατὰ τρίτον τροχαῖον (much less used by Ennius than by Homer), is unusually smooth. Hence the very rhythm of these two lines is exceptionally colourful, which is in harmony with the pictorial content.

From this short analysis it appears that Ennius' use of vocabulary, style, and metre is more organized and less arbitrary than we might have thought, and clearly oriented to produce an architectural whole and a poetic climax.

2. *Ennius and Homer*

Which Homeric elements are lacking in Ennius? On the whole, Ennius is shorter, and his syntax is tighter than Homer's. In detail, Ennius omits the attribute στατός ("stalled") which was logically dispensable since the trough had been mentioned. Neither is there

---

1 I am talking of colometry, not of syntax.

2 Epic periphrases consisting of a noun followed by another noun in the genitive: von Kameke, *op. cit.*, 65 (not quoting our passage).

mention of the horse bathing in the river and longing for the mares' pasture (*Iliad* 6. 511) nor does Ennius care about the cereal the horse had eaten. By avoiding details not immediately relevant to the point of the comparison, Ennius follows Alexandrian theory and practice.[1]

What is new in Ennius? He uses abstract nouns to pinpoint psychological facts (*magnis animis*;[2] *anima calida*[3]). The *magni animi* are given additional prominence by means of a calculated word order.[4] It is not sufficient to say that Ennius "animated"[5] the simile; the important thing is that Homer had subdued the psychological elements to the main action by introducing them in the form of participles (πεποιθώς; κυδιόων) whereas Ennius uses nouns, thus giving psychology more prominence and independence. Still more telling are the adjectives. The only adjective in the Homeric version of this simile (ἐϋρρεῖος, "well-flowing") is not specific but typical.[6] Such compounds with ἐϋ- and καλλι- convey the idea of a perfect and reliable world. As for specific or temporary qualities, Homer prefers to connect them with the action by using participles or adverbs rather than adjectives: στατός, ἀκοστήσας, ἀπορρήξας, κροαίνων, κυδιόων, ῥίμφα, ὑψοῦ.[7]

---

[1] For the Alexandrians' criticism of Homeric similes and the poetic practice of Apollonius of Rhodes, see A.Clausing, *Kritik und Exegese der homerischen Gleichnisse im Altertum* (diss. Freiburg, 1913), cf. also von Kameke, *op.cit.*, 30.

[2] Röser's explanation of this expression, *op. cit.*, 41, is wrong. I agree with U.Knoche, *Magnitudo animi*, *Philologus* Suppl. 27 (1935): 4. Being a φιλόλογος (O.Skutsch, *Studia Enniana* [London, 1968]: 6-7). Ennius might have known scholia mentioning γενναιότης (von Kameke, *op.cit.*, 26); but this assumption is not necessary.

[3] Columna and Heinze, quoted by von Kameke, *op. cit.*, 27. For *anima* see Enn., *Trag.* 182 Jocelyn.

[4] In Livius Andronicus already, word architecture is more prominent than in Homer: E.Fraenkel, "Livius Andronicus", *RE*, Suppl. 5 (1931): 6.

[5] Cf. Röser, *op.cit.*, passim. For anima *calida*: ibid., 44.

[6] On epithets: Emil Staiger, *Grundbegriffe der Poetik* (Zürich, 1946, 6th ed., 1963): 90-92.

[7] After finishing this paper, I discovered the following pertinent remarks (Goethe, "Zur Farbenlehre", 2. Abt., *Weimar Edition* II 3: 20): "Aber auch die sorgfältigste Übersetzung bringt immer etwas Fremdes in die Sache, wegen Verschiedenheit des Sprachgebrauchs.—Das Griechische ist dadurch naiver, zu einem natürlichen, heitern, geistreichen, ästhetischen Vortrag glücklicher Naturansichten viel geschickter. Die Art, durch Verba, besonders durch Infinitiven und Participien zu sprechen, macht jeden Ausdruck lässlich; es wird eigentlich nichts bestimmt, bepfählt und festgesetzt; es ist nur eine Andeutung, um den Gegenstand in der Einbildung hervorzurufen. Die lateinische Sprache wird dagegen durch den Gebrauch der Substantiven (sic) entscheidend und befehlshaberisch. Der Begriff ist im Wort fertig aufgestellt, mit welchem nun als einem wirklichen Wesen verfahren wird." One might add that in the Latin language the use of participles developed rather slowly; see E.Laughton, *The Participle in Cicero* (Oxford, 1964).

Ennius, on the contrary, uses adjectives to describe instantaneous qualities; for example, a chest raised at a certain moment is called *celsus*; a mane raised tossing is *altus*. Ennius also introduces adjectives of colour which are lacking in all parallel texts. He captures a transitory quality such as the whiteness of the horse's foam (*alba*), and even an atmospheric element, such as the misty-blue shade of distant meadows (*caerula* ... *prata*); such adjectives of colour, however, are not properly realistic (as von Kameke had thought),[1] rather they reflect psychological facts. Another group of adjectives emphasize vitality (*anima calida; laeta prata*)[2] and thereby contribute to the portrait of the horse's *magnus*[3] *animus*.

Finally, let us consider the simile as a whole. Despite its loose syntax, the Homeric simile by giving us a precise starting point and a precise goal conveys continuous movement from the beginning to the end. Ennius on the other hand, mentioning only the point of departure, does not care about the goal; instead, he tries to give an impression of the horse's force. Once he has sketched a portrait suggestive of power and vitality, he need not go on with the story. In sum, he replaces the continuous and harmonious flow of the Homeric simile with a structure purposefully oriented towards a final picture.

3. *Virgil, Homer, and Ennius*

The context of the Virgilian simile is well-known; the Latins' counsel of war is interrupted by a Trojan attack; after giving orders, Turnus arms himself and, without pausing to put on his helmet, runs down from the citadel. Before Turnus meets Camilla, the poet inserts the simile which reflects the hero's brisk movement and his excited anticipation of the battle (this is expressly stated in 11. 490-491: "Glittering in gold, he runs down from the high fortress; he exults in his soul, and in hope even now seizes his enemy"[4] *fulgebatque alta decurrens aureus arce / exsultatque animis et spe iam praecipit hostem*). In contrast to Homer (*Iliad* 6. 513-514), Virgil uses the main verbs to

---

[1] Von Kameke, *op.cit.*, 46 and 51-52.

[2] Von Kameke (*op.cit.*, 35-48) rightly stresses Ennius' willingness to follow Homer also in matters of adjectives. All the more significant are the differences which show up despite Ennius' efforts.

[3] In Homer adjectives meaning "great" are less common than in Latin epic.

[4] Translation adapted from: H.R.Fairclough (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1946).

express the brilliance of light and the psychological facts while external movement is conveyed through a participle.

Which elements does Virgil omit? Like Ennius he skips στατός, and still more reticent than Ennius, he does not tell us that the horse has eaten to its heart's content; he thought the idea was sufficiently suggested by *praesepia*. Röser (*op.cit.*, 44) assumed that Virgil was trying to reconcile the contradiction between trough and pasture; but such a contradiction does not exist since the main attraction of the pastures is not food, but love (cf. the mention of the mares) and freedom. Like Ennius, Virgil does not care to convey the horse's pleasure in its movement as such; he substitutes for the detail of its light and easy gallop the verb *tendit*, which has a psychological rather than graphic effect. Lastly, the Homeric epithet of the river is absent from the Virgilian simile as also from the Ennian one.

What are Virgil's additions? Most prominent is *tandem liber*, which strikes a psychological and affective note. Instead of describing the easy movement, the poet dwells on the pleasure the horse takes in its freedom. Adjectives reflect the horse's experience of the "open" field (*apertus*) and the "familiar" river (*notum*). Virgilian empathy transforms the objectivity of the Homeric world.

Above all, Virgil structures his simile differently. While adapting a greater number of Homeric elements than Ennius, he arranges them in his own way. First he mentions the point of departure (the trough), the way (the field), and the goal (the mares' pasture or the river). In reference to the goal, Virgil combines two motives mentioned separately in Homer (*Iliad* 6. 508 and 511) and, in a rational way, leaves it to the reader to make a choice between them (*aut* ... *aut*).[1] Unlike Homer, however, he concentrates all the information concerning the goal in the middle of the simile and thereby reserves the important final position for the impressive picture of the horse tossing his mane. Alliteration (*luxurians*[2] *luduntque; arrectis* ... *alte*), anaphora (*per* ... *per*), accumulation of liquids (*r* and *l*) and tripartite rhythm (prominence of trithemimeral and hepthemimeral cæsuras) contribute to the rich orchestration of this finale. Therefore, given the different position of the impressive picture of the tossing mane, in Homer the simile reaches its culmination in the centre, in Ennius and Virgil at the end. (Incidentally, an analogous principle can be observed in the structure

---

[1] Thus he consciously eschews the "contradiction" between the two goals mentioned by Homer (the river and the mares).

[2] κυδιόων.

of entire books: in Book 22 of the *Iliad*, the hero's death is placed in the middle of the book, in *Aeneid* 12 at the end).

While Virgil adopts the escalating pattern of Ennius, he does not reflect many details of the Ennian passage. Not only do we miss the colourful adjectives typical of the older poet, the drastic idea of the horse being stuffed, the impressionistic element of foam, but even the *magni animi* are lacking; description is superseded by sympathetic understanding. Of course, archaic features of metre[1] and style (coordination of two adjectives) are also abandoned. There is no trace of Ennius' nervous colourfulness nor his prickly staccato. What is more, we witness a new affinity to Homer not only in some details of content, but also in the use of participles (Virgil: *abruptis ... uinclis*; Ennius: *abrupit*; Virgil: *potitus*; Ennius *fert sese*). In the structure of his simile Virgil tried to combine specific qualities of Homer and Ennius with a new sympathetic approach of his own.

4. *Ennius and Apollonius Rhodius*

Strangely enough, it looks as if the readers of our Ennius simile have not yet paid due attention to Apollonius. Jason who has been strengthened by Medea's herbs performs a dance in his arms before ploughing the field with the fire-breathing bulls (Apoll. Rh. 3. 1259). In accordance with pre-Aristarchian criticism,[2] Apollonius strove to adapt the simile in all details to the main action. Thus, whereas Homer said that the horse was longing for the mares, a detail which contradicted the real situation[3] (actually, Paris was leaving Helen to join battle), our learned poet "corrects" this "fault" by specifying the horse as a war horse and omitting the mares. And, since Jason is not running, Apollonius leaves out the horse's gallop and, instead, adds some graphic features (the neighing; the pricked-up ears; the dance-like attitude of the horse; all this reveals the energy of Jason's dance).

The tight structure of this simile and the final position of the picture will come back in Ennius. Far from disavowing his Alexandrian training, Ennius is even more concerned with psychology and atmosphere, be it majestic or intimate.

---

[1] Caesura after the fifth longum. Final *-s* not "making position".
[2] Clausing, quoted above, n.1, p. 67.
[3] Fortunately! The contrary would be intolerable.

Epilogue: In Homer, the greatest concentration of syntactic and stylistic devices is found in the centre of the simile, in Ennius and Virgil, in accordance with rhetorical principles, at the end. The most graphic elements are set in the same places. Homer shows the whole of the horse's movement, whereas Ennius stops in the middle without mentioning a goal. We cannot, therefore, subscribe to Röser's statement (*op. cit.*, 65) that Ennius "generally replaces rest with motion", for in the present example one could maintain the contrary with equal right. Clearly, a mere opposition of rest and motion is not satisfactory; we should rather try to distinguish the specific character of the movements described in Homer and Ennius. Instead of the horse's principal motion, its gallop, Ennius is intrigued with the movements concomitant to it, the tossing of the mane and the foaming of the mouth. Adverbs stress the simultaneousness of primary and secondary motion (*simul*), and, together with the frequentative *quassat,* the adverb *saepe* suggests a characteristic tremolo. Ennius emphasizes movements which are liable to reveal psychological facts or to create an atmosphere.

It is frequently said that Roman poets fill their subject matter with inner life. Yet, to be more precise, psychology is not absent from Homer, but linguistically subordinate to the main action (mostly in the form of participles). In Ennius and Virgil, however, through the frequent use of affective nouns and adjectives, combined with rhetorical modes of expression, psychology becomes more independent and gains an impetus of its own.

These observations help to do greater justice to Virgil's simile than Röser did. It was not Virgil's only aim to animate Homer's simile and "translate" (Röser, *op. cit.*, 45) it as exactly as possible, but, as we have seen, to combine the total idea of the movement which is present in Homer with the suggestiveness of the final picture which he knew from Ennius.

Ennius' poetic mind was certainly influenced by the Alexandrian theory and practice of the epic simile. The tight and rational structure of his syntax and style give lie to all talk of archaic looseness and parataxis. By comparing Ennius with Apollonius, we have seen that this kind of syntax is Alexandrian, as is the use of a 'final picture' as a vignette. Yet, the pathos as well as the heavy archaic ornament of language and style which are used to achieve this are typically Roman, though assisted in their development by Hellenistic rhetoric.

In order to get a more specific idea of Ennius' talent, we should

shorten Röser's catalogue of key-words[1] rather than enlarge it. To Ennius, through his studies of grammar and rhetoric, Alexandrianism had become second nature. As for the Roman element, Ennius, being a provincial (as most of the Roman writers were to be), seems, as it happens, to have understood some features of the Roman mind better than many natives had. Our task is not to isolate the components of his thought, but to discover his specific synthesis of natural talent, Greek training, and the Latin language. Ennius' writing has been labelled "naturalistic"[2]—but is this term not blatantly contradicted by his "blue meadows" and "yellow sea"?[3] Though perhaps fostered by a Hellenistic taste for the recherché[4] or by the atmosphere of the Italian landscape, these colours are, above all, the expression of an independent character and a powerful will. This view is confirmed by Ennius' preference for active verbs.[5]

In the field of linguistic creativity, Röser[6] without hesitation ascribed to Ennius "undoubtedly a more genuine poetic power" (as compared to Virgil). Perhaps we should look out for subtler distinctions. An "intertextual" approach in the broader sense of the word allows us to consider the shifts and differences of phases occurring between the culturally "young" stylistic medium of the Latin language and the over-mature Greek civilization reflected in the models Ennius had at his disposal. The surface-charm of Ennius' text is certainly due to his specific sensibility; in his work, the Latin language develops a momentum of its own. While Homer reflects his subject matter in a mature linguistic medium, Ennius' poetry is, to a certain degree, the manifestation of a poetic language *in statu nascendi* which cannot yet reflect objects without conveying to them its specific dynamism and atmosphere. Hence, Ennius, though an enlightened and modern man from Magna Graecia, was more immediately exposed to the forces of the Latin language and was ready to yield to its allurements, whether majestic or playful, more spontaneously and less critically than Virgil. A classic is fastidious and more liable to oppose himself to the tendencies inherent in a language than a pioneer would be; but this is no proof against the "genuine poetic force" of a classic.

---

1 There seems to be too much generalization in Röser; esp. *op.cit.*, 65. In many respects, von Kameke is more subtle (e.g. *op.cit.*, 28).

2 Von Kameke, *op.cit.*, 52.

3 Enn., *Ann.* 384-385; cf. Gell. 2. 26. 21.

4 Röser, *op.cit.*, 42, n. 12.

5 Von Kameke, passim.

6 Ibid. 45.

"Ennius, mighty in genius, rude in art"[1] *Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis* (*Trist.* 2. 424): this Ovidian antithesis falls short. Though admiring Ennius' archaic linguistic potential, we ought not to underrate the amount of rational artistic planning in his work. The coexistence of both of these elements compels us either to modify or to drop the term "archaic" as applied to Latin literature. The difficulty of the application of this term is owing to the fact that early Roman civilization is an intriguing process of assimilation of a mature, and even over-mature, culture into the language and thought of a young nation. The more we succeed in replacing catchwords with specific details, the more lively our idea of early Roman literature will become.

---

[1] Translation adapted from A.L.Wheeler, Ovid, vol. 6: *Tristia. Ex Ponto* (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1924; repr. 1988).

CHAPTER FIVE

VIRGIL

1. Prooemium: *The Poet and his Reader*

The Iliad *and the* Odyssey *as Subtexts to the Proem of the* Aeneid *(1. 1-33)*[1]

Arma uirumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris
Italiam fato profugus Lauiniaque uenit
litora, multum ille et terris iactatus et alto
ui superum, saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram,
multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem
inferretque deos Latio; genus unde Latinum
Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae.
Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso
quidue dolens regina deum tot uoluere casus
insignem pietate uirum, tot adire labores
impulerit. tantaene animis caelestibus irae?
Urbs antiqua fuit (Tyrii tenuere coloni)
Karthago, Italiam contra Tiberinaque longe
ostia, diues opum studiisque asperrima belli,
quam Iuno fertur terris magis omnibus unam
posthabita coluisse Samo. hic illius arma,
hic currus fuit; hoc regnum dea gentibus esse,
si qua fata sinant, iam tum tenditque fouetque.
progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci
audierat Tyrias olim quae uerteret arces;
hinc populum late regem belloque superbum
uenturum excidio Libyae; sic uoluere Parcas.
id metuens ueterisque memor Saturnia belli,
prima quod ad Troiam pro caris gesserat Argis -
necdum etiam causae irarum saeuique dolores
exciderant animo; manet alta mente repostum
iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae
et genus inuisum et rapti Ganymedis honores:
his accensa super iactatos aequore toto
Troas, reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli,
arcebat longe Latio, multosque per annos
errabant acti fatis maria omnia circum.
tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem.

---

[1] Text: R.A.B.Mynors (Oxford, 1969; repr. 1972); Translation: C.Day Lewis (Oxford, 1952; paperback: New York, 1953).

I tell about war and the hero who first from Troy's frontier, / displaced by destiny, came to the Lavinian shores, / to Italy—a man much travailed on sea and land / by the powers above, because of the brooding anger of Juno, / suffering much in war until he could found a city / (5) and march his gods into Latium, whence rose the Latin race, / the royal line of Alba and the high walls of Rome. / Where lay the cause of it all? How was her godhead injured? / What grievance made the queen of heaven so harry a man / renowned for piety, through such toils, such a cycle of calamity? (10) / Can a divine being be so persevering in anger? / There was a town of old—men from Tyre colonised it—/ over against Italy and Tiber mouth, but afar off, / Carthage, rich in resources, fiercely efficient in warfare. / This town, they say, was Juno's favourite dwelling, preferred / (15) to all lands, even Samos: here were her arms, her chariot: / and even from the long-ago time she cherished the aim that this / should be, if fate allowed, the metropolis of all nations. / Nevertheless, she had heard a future race was forming / of Trojan blood, which one day would topple that Tyrian stronghold—/ (20) a people arrogant in war, born to be everywhere rulers / and root up her Libyan empire—so the Destiny-Spinners planned. / Juno, afraid of this, and remembering well the old war / wherein she had championed the Greeks whom she loved against the Trojans—/ besides, she has other reasons for rage, bitter affronts / (25) unblotted as yet from her heart: deep in her mind rankle / the judgment of Paris, the insult of having her beauty scorned, / her hate for Troy's origin, Ganymede taken and made a favourite—/ furious at these things too, she tossed all over the sea / the Trojans, the few that the Greeks and relentless Achilles had left, / (30) and rode them off from their goal, Latium. Many years / they were wandering round the seven seas, moved on by destiny. / So massive a task it was to found the Roman race.

It is our intention to incorporate the problem of Virgil's relationship to Homer into a study of the author's relationship to his reader and thereby to give, through an intertextual approach, a new direction to the old theme of *imitatio.*

The Proems of the Iliad *and of the* Odyssey *as Subtexts to the Proem of the* Aeneid

The relationship of Virgil and Homer has been studied at different periods from different points of view. Already in classical antiquity there were *obtrectatores Vergili* who accused the Roman poet of "theft"; but we also know of arguments in defence of Virgil starting from a Virgilian *dictum* reported by Donatus, which says that it is easier to deprive Hercules of his club than Homer of one line (*Vita Donati* 195). Of course, there are numerous parallel lines of Homer and Virgil, many of which Macrobius had collected in his *Saturnalia.* While the ancients read Virgil side by side with Homer, mediæval readers

read Virgil without Homer. The renaissance of Greek studies, however, would eventually revive interest in comparing the two poets. Julius Caesar Scaliger in his *Poetics* (1661), placed Virgil above Homer, whom he compared to an old chatterbox. In the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, the great epic poets of Europe rivalled both Virgil and Homer, who were equally respected. With the high appreciation of "original genius" and popular poetry from the Eighteenth Century onwards, Homer began to eclipse Virgil, a development which reached its climax with the German philhellenism in the Nineteenth Century. In the early Twentieth Century German scholars, such as Richard Heinze and Eduard Norden, rediscovered Virgil as a great poet, and subsequently his impact on German literature increased considerably. Later on, the question of Virgil's relationship to Homer became secondary to the study of the *Aeneid* as a work of art in itself (Friedrich Klingner, Viktor Pöschl, and Michael C.J.Putnam). It was Georg N.Knauer who once again took up our subject in his monumental book on the *Aeneid* and Homer (Göttingen, 1964). He not only collected specific verbal parallels and reminiscences, gathered from all of the commentaries on the *Aeneid*, but also analyzed corresponding scenes and major units in Virgil and Homer and drew our attention to Virgil's "typological" use of Homeric characters.[1]

Starting from the introductions to the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Aeneid*, we will try to answer the following questions: 1. How does Virgil read Homer? 2. What use does he make of Homeric reminiscences to prepare his readers for the *Aeneid*?

Let us first recall some aspects of the introduction to the *Iliad*.

1. The first line gives the theme, the wrath of Achilles. Although the name of Achilles frames lines 1-7, the poet of the *Iliad* does not choose for his subject a hero as such, but a great emotion, his wrath, a choice which is to be contrasted with the openings of the *Odyssey*, the cyclic poems, and the *Hymns* (except the *Hymn* to Aphrodite which announces "the works of Venus", ἔργα 'Αφροδίτης). The motif of wrath is the unifying thread of the *Iliad*, and there are two phases of Achilles' wrath, first, in defence of his honour, then in revenge for his friend.[2]

---

[1] Cf. E.Auerbach, "Figura", in his book: *Neue Dantestudien* (Istanbul, 1944): 11-71.

[2] W.Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien* (Leipzig, 1938 = *Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 43, 6).

2. The Muse is invoked in the imperative mood; the poet does not say that he is singing, but instead asks the Muse to sing. The invocation of the Muse is placed at the beginning and is not identical to the question which introduces the action.

3. The starting point of the narrative will be the conflict between Agamemnon and Achilles. Yet the poet reaches that point in an unusual way. In line 9 we hear that Apollo, who is angry with Agamemnon, punishes the army with a plague. Only in line 11 do we learn of the cause (οὕνεκα) of this punishment: the son of Atreus had dishonoured the priest Chryses. Until now (line 12), the facts have been recollected in reverse chronological order: the Greeks dying, (lines 2-5), Agamemnon and Achilles quarrelling (lines 6-7), Apollo in anger (line 9), Agamemnon insulting Chryses (line 11). Only from line 12 onward will we find a narrative which advances chronologically. In search of the causes, the introduction gradually goes back into the past until it reaches the starting point of the narrative. The fact that the introduction of the *Iliad* constitutes what might be called an "anti-narrative" does not seem to have been hitherto observed.

At first sight such a procedure is surprising since it contradicts what might be expected in a narrative poem. Yet there is some natural justification to it: the mechanism of memory recalls more easily what is more recent. The guiding principle of the arrangement of facts turns out to be not mimetic but mnemonic. Hence, it is not by chance that the invocation of the Muse (she who meditates and remembers) is placed at the beginning. Yet the mechanism of memory does not explain everything; there is also an intellectual impulse behind the poet's progression from results to causes.

Emotion is discovered as a stimulus to human actions (Achilles' wrath) and enters into a larger framework called the will or plan of Zeus (line 5).[1] In this context the poet observes a chain of causality: Agamemnon offends Apollo's priest; the god, in anger, sends the plague and provokes the dispute between Achilles and Agamemnon. Thus, the anger of the mortal is a consequence of the divine anger which, for its part, was caused by a mortal's injustice. There proves to be an intimate relationship between the behaviour of men and gods. Yet the poet also does not shrink from connecting the will of Zeus with the deaths of guiltless persons, deaths described with harsh realism.

---

[1] W.Kullmann, "Ein vorhomerisches Motiv im Iliasprooemium", *Philologus* 99 (1955): 167-192.

Let us now turn to the introduction to the *Odyssey*.

1. The first place is not given to an emotion but to a man. Ulysses is the subject of the verbs to follow. It is he, not wrath, that causes what happens, and it is not the people but he who has to suffer. Unlike Achilles, he is not subject to a great emotion; rather, what matters to him is seeing and knowing, that is to say, a rational approach. Also unlike Achilles, he does not endanger the other Greeks, but tries to help his companions to return to their homes; ethos eclipses pathos. To enforce this, the poet stresses that it is not Ulysses who is responsible for his companions' fate, but they for themselves. This slightly apologetic touch is in tune with the exaltation of Ulysses to the rank of the destroyer of Troy (line 1).

2. The Muse is invoked. It is, however, not for her to sing, but to name the hero to the author (μοι), who will come back to the invocation in line 10 and thus provide the introduction with a frame.

3. The chronological point of departure is the destruction of Troy. Because the goal of the wanderings is not mentioned explicitly, the reader is left in suspense.[1] As in the *Iliad*, the introduction does not anticipate future events in detail. The proem of the *Odyssey* is "open" in the sense that it announces only in part things to come. Other themes, such as Poseidon's wrath, appear only after the introduction, which, through a subtle network of correspondences (and by its very incompleteness) is woven into the body of Book 1. Unlike the proem of the *Iliad*, the whole of the introduction to the *Odyssey* is not structured according to the principle of reverse chronology. This technique occurs only once in order to explain the reason for the companions' deaths and its function is comparable to what we had found in the *Iliad*. In fact, the causal connection is the same: misdeeds of humans, divine punishment, deaths of humans. In the *Odyssey* causality is more strict since the guilty and the punished are identical (a point vigorously stressed by the poet) whereas in the *Iliad* divine wrath falls upon a multitude of innocent beings.

By way of digression, it should be noted that these observations strongly favour the authenticity of lines 6-9, ascribed by Schadewaldt[2] to another poet. The above-mentioned pattern of structural analogies and critical references to the introduction of the *Iliad* does not incline us to isolate these lines, in which we find the same principles

---

1 A goal will be mentioned in the introduction of Apollonius of Rhodes.

2 Homer, *Die Odyssee*, übersetzt in deutsche Prosa von W.Schadewaldt (Hamburg, 1958): 329.

at work as in the rest of the proem: to justify the hero, to establish a theodicy, and to introduce a rational mechanism of guilt and punishment; all of this is in line with the poet's larger aims. The proem of the *Odyssey* shows the hero in a favourable light and, in contrast to the emotional theme of the *Iliad*, dwells on ethos and rational explanations. Moreover, the goal of Ulysses' travels can only be inferred from that of his companions (lines 5 and 9). The adjective which characterizes the companions, νήπιοι ("unwise"), is deliberately used to set in relief Ulysses' wisdom and experience and thereby contributes to the exaltation of the hero's chief quality. This is a fine touch of indirect characterization without which the introduction would lose its keystone.

The prooemium *of the* Aeneid *as introduction to the whole of the poem*

How does the poet prepare his readers to understand the *Aeneid*? What kind of expectations does he raise, and how will they be realized in the course of the work? How does the use of certain words and structures guide the readers' expectations? What do we learn from the *prooemium* about the narrator's point of view, the general framework of the action, and the use of factual information? As knowledge of Homer is a platform which the author and his readers have in common, the poet may consider this knowledge a part of his "language", a means to inform his readers more precisely about his intentions. This leads us back to the two questions we asked initially: How does Virgil read Homer? And how does he make use of his readers' knowledge of Homer to help them understand the *Aeneid*? Some of these aspects of Virgil's art are perhaps less self-evident than we might expect. Our attempt will be to elucidate the way Virgil applied this technique in his introduction.

A reading of the *Aeneid* with special attention to the gradual accumulation of information given by the poet might help to make evident the relationship between poet and reader. Since such a reading of the *Aeneid* implies a certain guidance of the reader's mind on the part of the poet, it might be called a "rhetorical" one. Let it be said at once, however, that by rhetoric here we do not mean the utilitarian spectre which Benedetto Croce, with more brilliance than truth, opposed to poetry; in fact we are not thinking of a rhetoric outside poetry, not even of a rhetoric within poetry, but a rhetoric of poetry.

1. *Arma uirumque cano*
Two types of translation, both correct, are indicative of an hermeneutic problem, i.e. a problem concerning the method and theory of interpretation. Both Dryden ("Arms and the man I sing") and C.Day Lewis ("I tell about war and the hero") are right. The former can claim to say what Virgil said, the latter, what he very probably meant to say. (This is one of the reasons why, although there is one single text, there are, and have to be, many translations.) Suppose we are right in assuming that Virgil meant "war". Why then did he not use the good Latin word *bellum* as he did in Book 7. 41? If some of us feel the word *arma* ("weapons") to be more evocative, what kind of expectations did this word raise? The fact that Virgil did not think with a collector's interest of weapons as mere objects, but of weapons as tools, as instruments of warfare, was more obvious to an ancient audience than to the modern theoreticians who sometimes tend to ascribe to epic poets a naïve delight in objects. Therefore, the translation "war" or "battles" correctly renders the dynamism of the Latin word and its orientation towards action, though it falls short of the emotional and literary undertones of the Latin term. The emotional aspect of *arma* becomes evident from 7. 460-462: "Madly yelling for arms, by his bed, through his house he hunts for them; crazy with bloodlust, with a criminal mania for fighting, still more, with resentment"[1] *arma amens fremit, arma toro tectisque requirit:/ saeuit amor ferri et scelerata insania belli / ira super.* These lines evoke an atmosphere of alarm. Incidentally, such a connotation is confirmed etymologically: the English word "alarm", through French "alarme", goes back to Italian "all'arme", which exactly reflects the Latin *ad arma.*

As for the literary implications, the word is suggestive of heroic poetry; consider, for example, its connection with *ira,* a traditional epic theme ever since Homer. Horace, when trying to describe Ennius' epic poetry with one word, not fortuitously, again chooses *arma* (*Epist.* 1. 19. 7-8 *ad arma prosiluit dicenda*). Ennius himself had in all probability used the word *arma* programmatically. When hearing the first word *arma,* Virgil's audience felt he would compete with heroic poetry in the vein of Homer and Ennius.

How do these expectations come true? The 7th Book, which opens the "Iliadic" half of the *Aeneid* and introduces the war (*horrida bella* 7.

---

[1] Translation: C.Day Lewis (Oxford, 1952; Paperback: New York, 1953).

41) and the atmosphere of alarm, contains an explicit claim to epic grandeur (7. 44-45). That arms serve as instruments of war in the *Aeneid* is self-evident and in need of little textual support. What may not be obvious to a reader of the *prooemium*, however, is that in the *Aeneid* weapons are also instruments of knowledge: upon seeing the belt which Turnus stripped from Pallas, Aeneas is reminded of his duty to take revenge for his friend. That is, arms serve not only as *instrumenta*, but also as *monumenta* (12. 945), literally "means of recalling". Arms even seem to participate actively in events. The glimmer of a plundered helmet betrays Euryalus to his enemies (9. 374-375); the golden arms of an enemy seduce Camilla to carelessness and death (11. 778-782); Dido kills herself with a sword which Aeneas had given her (a *monumentum* transformed into an *instrumentum*). Therefore, the poet mentions arms when they are indicative of deeper relationships, such as love and death or guilt and punishment, and since arms participate in the action, it is fitting that they are mentioned together with the man (*uirum*) in the introduction.

As for *uirum*, the singular was striking to a Roman ear since Virgil's predecessors, Naevius and Ennius, had considered the individuals less relevant to the course of history[1]. The avoidance of the plural form is symptomatic of the transition from the Republic to the Principate. If Virgil did not choose Augustus for his hero but Aeneas, he might have done so out of good taste (actually, there would have been a strange discrepancy between contemporary Roman characters and the divine machinery of traditional epic). It is more important, however, to consider the viewpoint chosen by the poet. Unlike historians who review the events in retrospect, the poet, like a prophet, tries to visualize history as a future development, seen from its earliest point. Hence, Aeneas is not an allegory of Augustus, but a kind of prototype of a Roman hero, *uir*, the man. To readers who know the *Odyssey*, and no doubt Virgil's readers did, the accusative "the man" is indicative of the poet's design: Virgil intends to compete with the *Odyssey*. In Virgil's poem the sequence *Iliad-Odyssey*, hinted at in *arma uirumque*, will be reversed; Books 1-6 will be the Roman "*Odyssey*", Books 7-12 the Roman "*Iliad*". Like Ulysses, Aeneas is harried by the wrath of a deity, and a further parallel between them is suggested by the mention of the hero's sufferings and the anaphora *multum* ... *multa*

[1] The plural "men" is also familiar to us from the cyclic poets (*Schol. Aristoph. Pax* 1270, cf. also Apollonius Rhodius 1. 1, and the song of Achilles, *Iliad* 9. 189).

which evokes πολλὰ ... πωλλῶν ... πολλά. While Homer limits himself to the sufferings on sea, Virgil announces, in addition, sufferings on land in the wars to come, an element not alien to the *Odyssey*, but not explicitly stated in the introduction proper. Virgil concentrates a maximum of meaning in his opening lines, reworking the introduction to the *Odyssey* in the spirit of the more laconic introduction to the *Iliad*.

Yet, Aeneas is not πολύτροπος. His character is defined in Roman terms: he is "renowned for piety", *insignis pietate*. Being called *uir* in the emphatic sense of the word, he is the bearer of Roman *uirtus* (cf. 12. 435 *uirtus*, wilfully next to *puer*). Elsewhere, the juxtaposition of *pietas* with *arma* (6. 403) suggests the description of Aeneas as an *exemplum uirtutis*. Finally, *fato profugus* sets a main theme: much less than Achilles or Ulysses, Aeneas is his own master; he is subject to destiny, dependent on divine guidance, the bearer of the household gods and of a great future. This pattern of Aeneas' existence conveys a sense of Rome's historical and political mission; it brings together feelings of *pietas* both for the past, represented by Troy and Aeneas' father, and for the future, embodied in Lavinium, Rome, and Aeneas' son.

The first sentence of the *Aeneid* ends with *cano*. The announcement of the theme in the first person, which is reminiscent of the cyclic poets, is to be distinguished from the invocation to the Muse which appears later (line 8). Its position roughly corresponds to the second invocation in the *Odyssey* (line 12), but its function is different: in the *Odyssey* this invocation closes a paragraph, in the *Aeneid* it opens a new one. As for the first person verb, it is absent from the beginnings of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but appears in *Fragment* 15 of the *Little Iliad*; and when it is used in introductions, the future tense is generally preferred (cf. Apollonius 1. 1 and Virgil *Georgics* 1. 5). For the opening line of a great epic, *cano* is, therefore, unusually personal and unusually simple. To be sure, the opening lines of Livius Andronicus and Naevius paved the way for the architectural conciseness of the beginning of the *Aeneid* and Virgil's lapidary style, his avoidance of meretricious adornments, his "grand and disciplined diction" *grandis et, ut ita dicam, pudica oratio*,[1] is more in the vein of Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum* than of Ennius' *Annales*.

---

[1] Cf. Petronius 2. 6.

2. *Lines 1-7*

After the three initial words, the first long sentence of our text is framed by the names of two cities, Troy (line 1) and Rome (line 7), and that the first seven lines of the *Iliad* are similarly framed by the name of Achilles. Virgil certainly felt the expressiveness of this structure and meaningfully exploited it by substituting the individual hero's name with the cities of Troy and Rome to call attention to the scope of his epic. These names mark the starting point and the ultimate goal of Aeneas' journey; his immediate goal, however, is the foundation of Lavinium. It is also telling that, while the *Iliad* announces the destruction of an old city, the *Aeneid* prepares for the birth of a new one, and in this sense it is an "anti-*Iliad*". Yet Virgil is quite unlike Homer in giving his epic an historical goal in the distant future (the foundation of Rome). Although the *Iliad* at one point mentions the future historical role of the Aeneads (20. 307-308), this isolated passage cannot be compared with the *Aeneid*, a poem which, as a whole and in its details, is dominated by that prophetic orientation. As is suggested by the position of the names, the action of the *Aeneid* develops between these two poles. The journey itself is inseparably connected with an intellectual process: since Aeneas' future is to be sought at the place of his ultimate origin, he can find his goal only by means of a thorough knowledge of his past, and this will be a crucial theme of Book 3. Already in Book 1, however, the fall of Troy is represented as a condition for the rise of Rome (1. 238-239); Troy and Rome symbolize death and birth, not birth and death. This unusual and unrealistic order is the core of Virgil's bold poetic invention: the "death" of Troy is behind Aeneas, the "birth" of Rome his task for the future. Moreover, the poet of the *Odyssey* had used the fall of Troy as a chronological marker; Virgil, by the names of Troy, Lavinium, and Rome, establishes a geographical framework (as he will do with Carthage, Italy, and Rome, lines 12-33). There is a marked antithesis to the *Odyssey* in the idea of making his hero the founder, not the destroyer, of a city. In accordance with this inversion of the theme of the *Odyssey*'s first line, Virgil names Rome at the end of the first seven lines. Here again we observe a striving for more concentration and explicitness as compared to the *Odyssey*. The narrator's choice of a quite unusual point of view becomes evident in line 6, where, for a moment, Virgil adopts the regular historical perspective which, from its own present, looks back into the past ("whence rose the Latin race" *genus unde Latinum*). Replacing this

traditional "ætiological" perspective with a "prophetic" one, Virgil manages to combine myth and history into a unified work of art, and thereby resolves for the first time a problem inherent in all of Roman epic since Naevius.

3. *Lines 8-11*

Virgil does not invoke the Muse until lines 8-11, where he inquires into the reasons for Juno's wrath. The Muse is asked to help him to look back into the distant past. She has to recall it (*memorare*) as befits her, being a daughter of Mnemosyne (this post-Homeric genealogy had been well-known in Rome since Livius Andronicus, *Frg.* 23 Morel = 21 Blänsdorf). The poet needs some divine assistance in order to enlarge the scope of his consciousness and to cope with Juno's superhuman memory (cf. line 4, "mindful wrath" *memor ira*). The help of the Muse who has to supplement the poor human memory of the poet will be needed again before the catalogues (cf. *Iliad* 2, 484-486; 11. 218-220; *Aeneid* 7. 641-646; 10. 163-165).

An invocation of the Muse introduces a paragraph which is concerned with two theological problems: why is a man of outstanding moral qualities subject to divine wrath, and how can anger be conceived of in a divinity? The theme of divine wrath, which in the *Odyssey* had covered only a small part of the poem, is essential to the whole of the *Aeneid* and will be brought to an end explicitly in Book 12 (830-831). Consequently, this theme is present in all parts of the introduction (lines 4, 12, and 25). The anger of a deity had been one of the themes of the *Odyssey*, but there it had been introduced later than in the *Aeneid* (*Aen.* 1. 4; *Od.* 1. 20). By transferring this motif to the beginning, however, Virgil indicates that, unlike the *Odyssey*, where the impact of Poseidon's wrath is limited to a few books, the wrath of Juno will be seminal to the entire epic. The word *irae* is given prominence by its position at the very end of the second section of the proem (11)—in antithesis to the *Iliad* which starts with the keyword μῆνιν. Equally, Juno's wrath is mentioned in the very centre of the first paragraph (4). The third section of the introduction (12-33) reveals, in a retrospective search for causes, connections between human error and divine revenge and thus forms a counterpart to the opening lines of the *Iliad*. Encouraged by the "archæologies" of historians,[1] Virgil goes further back into the past than Homer had

[1] Perhaps Virgil's connection with historiography is signalled as early as line 1 by the initials of the first three words (A.V.C.), which are the same as those of *ab urbe*

done, but the anti-chronological orientation of Virgil's introduction is in full accord with what we found in the *Iliad.* Yet while in the *Iliad* the motif of wrath is attributed to a man as well as to a god, in the *Aeneid* it is limited to Juno. The very fact that the motif is introduced so early in the poem signals that a secondary motif of the *Odyssey* will gain Iliadic importance.

4. *Lines 12-33*

Just as two significant names of cities framed the first part of the introduction, so does the third part start with Carthage (13-14), and end with Rome (33). While the antithesis Troy-Rome marked the line of Aeneas' destiny, the pair Rome-Carthage introduces the dramatic antagonism and anchors Juno's wrath in history and geography. The first thing to be said of Carthage is *Italiam contra* (13). The poet juxtaposes the names of the two sides in the historical conflict, thus making political sense of a geographical fact. Far from being an escapist, Virgil does not shrink from geographical and historical facts, but to draw attention to them exploits structural devices such as the strategic positioning of words. Juno's anger, however, is anchored not only in space but in time. Unlike Poseidon's wrath, which had been caused by Ulysses himself, the motives of Juno's anger are to be sought in the distant past and in the remote future. Significantly, Virgil starts with the future (*id metuens* 23): Juno, the patronness of Carthage, is envious of the great future promised to Rome (12-22). The past is mentioned only in the second place: Juno hates all Trojans because of the judgement of Paris, Ganymede's rape and her own jealousy of Electra, the mother of Dardanus (*genus inuisum,* cf. 23-28). Hence, it is because of his forbears and his progeny that Juno hates Aeneas. As imagined by Virgil, Aeneas also carries on his shoulders his father (Book 2) as well as the fate of his grandsons (Book 8). Therefore, as an individual he must, at the same time, suffer a curse upon his race and bear the promise for his race. Since the future is present in Juno's fear (23), it is from the future that the *Aeneid* gets its orientation. Consequently, the entire paragraph (12-22) starts with the future and ends with the past.

---

condita: H.Froesch, "*Arma uirumque cano.* Beobachtungen zu den Eingangswörtern der *Aeneis*", *Anregung* 37 (1991): 309-312 (with interesting parallels from Catullus, Propertius, and the *Vita Donati*).

5. *Conclusions*

How does Virgil read Homer? Virgil's reading of Homer might be termed a literary "summit". It is a very close reading, not only in a quantitative sense (consider the reappearance of most of the details of the Homeric models in the *Aeneid*), but also in a qualitative sense. Not satisfied to accumulate diverse elements, Virgil achieved a real fusion of the introductions to the *Iliad* and to the *Odyssey*. His demanding attitude as a reader appears from the way he distances himself from the loose structure of the introduction to the *Odyssey* by applying to it the high standards of the *Iliad*. The fruit of this double-checking of Homer against Homer is seen in the concentration of motifs and enrichment of meaning we observed in lines 1-7; even the place of the major breaks, after line 7 and line 11,[1] recalls the *Iliad* as a model of conciseness. The retrospective search for causes is Iliadic as well.

In Virgil's critical reading of Homer the standards suggested by the best pages of the *Iliad* are enforced by Hellenistic ideas of unity and by a strictly functional use of detail. Virgil tries to incorporate each single element of his model even more organically into a new whole. In so doing, he was greatly encouraged by his specifically Roman historical perspective which allowed him to outdo the *Iliad* by replacing the fall of an old city with the rise of a new one, and the *Odyssey* by giving "the return to the native land" a symbolic meaning and a broader historical sense. Virgil's creation of a myth as a prototype and prefiguration of Roman history presupposes the Hellenistic methods of allegorical, or, rather, "typological" reading; as a reader of Homer, Virgil is part of a long and complicated tradition of reading, the methods of which he would expect to be applied to his own works as well. There is an inseparable interaction between methods of reading and methods of composing ("reception" and "production") in Virgil's genius.[2] As he could expect his readers to have some knowledge of Homer and of Homeric exegesis, his complete assimilation of the Homeric tradition did not enslave him but provided him with an extremely subtle and precise code of signs facilitating communication with his readers.

---

[1] Virgil's introduction is subdivided into three times eleven lines by P.Dräger, "Zu Gliederung und Syntax des Aeneis-Prooemiums (1. 1-33)", *Anregung* 40 (1994): 239-247.

[2] Ernst Zinn's observation, quoted by G.N.Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer* (Göttingen, 1960): 548 (index nominum).

This leads us to the question of how Virgil used Homeric remininscences to introduce his readers to the *Aeneid.* In Virgil's times there was no educated reader who did not know Homer. The audience's expectations of what an epic should be were conditioned to a large extent by their knowledge of Homer. How, then, did Virgil exploit the expectations of his public? The Homeric reminiscences in the *Aeneid* may be read in terms of an interplay between the traditional expectations of the reader and Virgil's innovative reinterpretation of the aims of an epic poet. To achieve this goal, Virgil uses keywords and structural devices. The juxtaposition of *arma* and *uirum,* for example, conveys the overall idea of combining *Iliad* and *Odyssey,* while the meaning of keywords is also stressed by structural devices (observe the initial position of the quoted words or the final position of *irae* in line 11). To explain his own intentions, Virgil exploits structural patterns drawn from the model by giving them a new function: the anaphora *multum ... multa* is enriched by the antithesis of danger on the sea and war on land to foreshadow the two halves of the *Aeneid;* as a frame for lines 1-7, the name of Achilles is replaced by the programmatic antithesis of Troy and Rome. Thus, the reader's knowledge of Homer is used as a system of coordinates helping him to identify Virgil's intentions. It is in this way that the reader immediately comes to accept Virgil's bold poetic design to the point of almost forgetting its boldness. Taking a second glance, however, he will realize that the Homeric reminiscences are, at the same time, the best means to measure Virgil's originality and creativity. The "dialogue" between Virgil and Homer is not limited to the esoteric sphere of poetic craftmanship; it is, rather, an essential part of the dialogue between author and reader.

Let us now come to the specific guidance the author gives to his readers in the proem of the *Aeneid.* In the first part of the introduction, Virgil first mentions the past (Troy), then the "present" (the Aeneas story), and finally the future (Rome). The first words *arma uirumque* make Virgil's readers understand that he is going to combine an "*Iliad*" and an "*Odyssey*". Homer had hinted at the theme of fate in line 5 of the *Iliad* (the will of Zeus was fullfilled) and in line 17 of the *Odyssey* ("when the gods had allotted to him to return home"); in contrast to the *Iliad,* Virgil gives fate a positive orientation (construction instead of destruction); as compared to the *Odyssey,* he gives it a larger scope and a more distant historical goal. Fate is thus redefined in terms of an historical goal. The idea that Aeneas' goal is

in fact his original home is an invention of Virgil's which allows him to take over the overall design of the *Odyssey* and give it a more profound meaning. The second part of the introduction articulates the problem of Juno's wrath, which is essential to Virgil's design. It also contains an invocation of the Muse to enhance the scope of the poet's mind and memory. The third part, a significant inversion of natural chronology, starts with the future (Carthage–Rome), then turns to the past (Troy), and ends with the present (Aeneas). The first and the third parts, in perfect harmony of structure and meaning, are framed by significant names of cities.

As for Virgil's concept of epic poetry, we may draw the following conclusions:

1. The calculated shift from the narrative's present to the narrator's present, and vice versa, provides a twofold enrichment of the epic genre. The "flashback" into the past is part of an historiographic technique (the so-called *archaeologia*) while historical prophecy is reminiscent of the apocalyptic genre. The traditional idea of epic is not sufficient to describe Virgil's creation.

2. Already in the introduction Aeneas is held responsible for past and future. Since both guilt and punishment are beyond the scope of his individual life, the *Aeneid* is less a drama of character than of knowledge: Aeneas has to discover both his origin and his destination. For a similar reason the epic poet needs a universal memory which can be bestowed upon him only by the Muse. The hero's role as a representative of his people is also evident from the fact that at the end of the introduction, he is replaced by the group (*Troas* in line 30).

3. Virgil's poetic use of objects can be described in terms of *instrumentum* (means of shaping the future) and *monumentum* (means of recalling the past). The use of geographical and historical evidence shows that the reality of Roman history is the goal of Virgil's mythical story. Virgil chooses a poetic point of view which allows him to represent myth *in actu*, as if it were reality, and actual history *in potentia*, as something to become real only in the future.

Epilogue: The neat and meaningful form of the introduction makes the reader almost forget how unusual, even paradoxical some features of Virgil's conception are (consider the anti-realistic sequence death – birth). What means does Virgil use to make his new ideas seem familiar to the reader, to prepare him without shocking him? First,

some expectations of his readers, which result from their knowledge of the tradition (Homer, Ennius), are utilized to make the new element more noticeable by contrast with the old (*arma*: like Ennius, *uirumque*: unlike him; combination of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in reverse order: larger scope of historical prophecy as compared to Homer). Second, Virgil creates new expectations in the reader's mind by the skilful use of key words at strategic points. The guidance Virgil gives his readers in his introduction is a striking example of what may be called the "rhetoric" of epic. Even quite literally, the rhetorical doctrine of *prooemium* serves to explain the principles followed by the author in guiding his reader. In this context intertextuality (in the narrower sense of the word), the systematic use of the reader's knowledge of Homer, forms an essential part of Virgil's poetic language. He exploits intertextual relationships within the framework of his art, preparing his reader for an adequate understanding of the *Aeneid*. On a more abstract level ("fusion of generic codes"), the principles of epic, rhetorical, and historical *prooemium* conspire to produce a new and unique text fulfilling the specific requirements of an introduction and to help us discover both how bold and unusual Virgil's conception of epic is and how skilfully he succeeded in conveying it to his readers as the most natural thing in the world.

2. Narratio: *Aeneas' Account of his Flight (With Special Regard to* Aeneid *2. 250-297)*[1]

Vertitur interea caelum et ruit Oceano nox
inuoluens umbra magna terramque polumque
Myrmidonumque dolos; fusi per moenia Teucri
conticuere; sopor fessos complectitur artus.
et iam Argiua phalanx instructis nauibus ibat
a Tenedo tacitae per amica silentia lunae
litora nota petens, flammas cum regia puppis
extulerat, fatisque deum defensus iniquis
inclusos utero Danaos et pinea furtim
laxat claustra Sinon. illos patefactus ad auras
reddit equus laetique cauo se robore promunt
Thessandrus Sthenelusque duces et dirus Vlixes,
demissum lapsi per funem, Acamasque Thoasque
Pelidesque Neoptolemus primusque Machaon

[1] Text: R.A.B.Mynors, Oxonii 1969; Translation: C.Day Lewis (Oxford, 1952; Paperback: New York, 1953).

et Menelaus et ipse doli fabricator Epeos.
inuadunt urbem somno uinoque sepultam;
caeduntur uigiles, portisque patentibus omnis
accipiunt socios atque agmina conscia iungunt.
tempus erat quo prima quies mortalibus aegris
incipit et dono diuum gratissima serpit.
in somnis, ecce, ante oculos maestissimus Hector
uisus adesse mihi largosque effundere fletus,
raptatus bigis ut quondam, aterque cruento
puluere perque pedes traiectus lora tumentis.
ei mihi, qualis erat, quantum mutatus ab illo
Hectore qui redit exuuias indutus Achilli,
uel Danaum Phrygios iaculatus puppibus ignis!
squalentem barbam et concretos sanguine crinis
uulneraque illa gerens, quae circum plurima muros
accepit patrios. ultro flens ipse uidebar
compellare uirum et maestas expromere uoces:
'o lux Dardaniae, spes o fidissima Teucrum,
quae tantae tenuere morae? quibus Hector ab oris
exspectate uenis? ut te post multa tuorum
funera, post uarios hominumque urbisque labores
defessi aspicimus! quae causa indigna serenos
foedauit uultus? aut cur haec uulnera cerno?'
ille nihil, nec me quaerentem uana moratur,
sed grauiter gemitus imo de pectore ducens,
'heu fuge, nate dea, teque his' ait 'eripe flammis.
hostis habet muros; ruit alto a culmine Troia.
sat patriae Priamoque datum: si Pergama dextra
defendi possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent.
sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia penatis;
hos cape fatorum comites, his moenia quaere
magna pererrato statues quae denique ponto.'
sic ait et manibus uittas Vestamque potentem
aeternumque adytis effert penetralibus ignem.

So now the sky rolled round, and night raced up from the ocean / (250) voluminously shrouding the earth and heaven's vault / and the villainous scheme of the Greeks. Not a sound from the Trojans, supine / along the walls, tired out, in the embrace of sleep. / And now the main Greek army was moving from Tenedos / in fleet formation, under the favouring silences / of a quiet moon, (255) towards the coast they knew so well. / Their leading galley had signalled with flame: Sinon, protected / by fate's injustice, stealthily unlocked the wooden horse / and let the Greeks out from its belly. The horse disgorged, the men / burst revelling forth from its hollow flank into the fresh air—/ (260) Thessander and Sthenelus in the lead, with Ulysses the terrible, / sliding down a rope they had lowered—Acamas, Thoas, / Neoptolemus son of Peleus, Machaon and Menelaus, / and Epeus —the man who had actually built the clever contraption. / They broke out over a city drowned in drunken sleep; / (265) they killed the sentries and then threw open the gates, admitting / their main body, and joined in the

pre-arranged plan of attack. / It was the hour when worn-out men begin to get / some rest, and by god's grace genial sleep steals over them. / I dreamt, I seemed to behold our Hector standing before me, / (270) most woebegone and shedding great tears, just as he'd looked once / in death, after being dragged by the chariot, black with the dirt / and blood, his swollen feet pierced where the thongs had been threaded. / Ah, god! what a sight he was! how terribly changed from the Hector / who once came back arrayed in the armour of Achilles, / (275) who came back from bombarding the Greek navy with fire! / Now his beard is matted, clotted with blood his hair, / he exhibits the many wounds received while defending his country / in combat around the walls. I too am weeping. Unasked, I / address him in my dream, force out these sorrowful words: / (280)—O light of Troy! O surest hope of the Trojans! What has / been keeping you so long? What shores do you come from, Hector? / Long have we looked for you: how happily now we behold you—/ we whom the death of many friends, the manifold ordeal / of city and folk have exhausted! But why is your face, serene once, / (285) so shamefully disfigured? Why do I see these wounds? / He gave no heed at all to these futile questions of mine, / but heaving a heavy sigh from the depth of his heart, spoke out: /—Goddess-born, you must go, you must save yourself from these flames. / The enemy's within the gates. Troy's tower is falling, falling. / (290) You owe no more to your country or Priam: if strong right hands could save our town, this hand of mine would have saved it long ago. / Her holy things, her home-gods Troy commends to your keeping: / take these as partners in your fate, for these search out / the walls you are destined to build after long roaming the seaways. (295) / He spoke, he picked up the holy headbands, the puissant Vesta / and her undying fire from out the temple sanctuary.

It is impossible to cover the whole of Book 2 in a short chapter.[1] After a brief account of the expectations raised by Aeneas in his introduction as well as of his significant omissions, we will concentrate on one crucial scene, Aeneas' dream of Hector.

Themes Mentioned and Omitted in the First Lines of Book 2

What are we told about Aeneas at the beginning of Book 2? First, Aeneas is called a father (*pater Aeneas* 2: theme 1). Second, Aeneas is said to be overwhelmed with grief (*infandum dolorem* 3; *lacrimis* 8: theme 2). Third, Aeneas is an eye-witness to the fall of Troy (*ipse uidi* 5: theme 3). Fourth, Aeneas was personally involved in the action (*et quorum pars magna fui* 6; he identifies himself with Troy: theme 4).

---

[1] Cf. M.von Albrecht, "Zur Selbstdarstellung des Aeneas im 2. Buche der *Aeneis*", in: id., *Der Mensch in der Krise. Unterrichtliche Aspekte augusteischer Dichtung* (Freiburg und Würzburg, 1981 = *Heidelberger Texte, Didaktische Reihe* 12): 5-15.

Each of these four themes invites a complementary one: Aeneas as a father—as a son; his grief—his hopes; his vision of death—his vision of future life; his identification with a Trojan past and his identification with his later mission. The reader is prepared to read the book along these lines. However, if we compare the initial paragraph with the book itself, we notice the absence of crucial themes at the beginning: there is no hint at the Greek's guile (theme 5) nor at Aeneas' flight (theme 6). At the end of this chapter we will have to inquire into the reasons for these omissions.

An Ænigmatic Dream as a Tragic Prologue: Aeneas and Hector

Our scene (2. 250-297) opens the second part of Book 2 (250-633). In classical literature, night frequently serves as a setting for revelation[1] and as a dark foil throwing into relief the symbolism of light and vision (theme 3). In fact, while many other Trojans sleep in ignorance (*urbem somno uinoque sepultam* 265), Aeneas has an important vision (*uisus* 271), which shows that, unlike other Trojans, he will have a future. Since in our scene Aeneas, as an eye-witness (theme 3), first sees the future, then the present, one would expect his actual behaviour in the rest of Book 2 to be modelled on his knowledge of the future. In reality, however, past and future will determine his behaviour in different, even contradictory ways. Being the bearer of the future, Aeneas ought to flee at once; but as defender of the past, he has to stay and fight. This is what he will do first, although the present vision, which precedes all of Aeneas' battles, is indicative of the futility of Aeneas' fighting and makes us impatient for Aeneas to flee. The present scene gives the reader full information before the beginning of the action and might be considered therefore a tragic prologue in which the dead Hector is the speaker.

Aeneas' Futile Questions: Contrast of Emotions

The second element which is essential to Aeneas' dream is its emotional background (theme 2). There is the intentional contrast between the softness of sleep (*gratissima* 269) and the heart-rending vision (*maestissimus* 270); adjectives (*maestissimus, maestus*), interjections (*ei mihi*), pronominal adjectives (*qualis, quantum*), a participle

---

[1] Similarly, Aeneas tells his story to Dido during the night (8).

(*flens*), and a noun (*fletus*), all add emotional poignancy; and even more evocative is the realistic description of Hector's defiled body (272-277). Both in the beginning and at the centre of the scene a happier atmosphere provides a contrast: Virgil briefly evokes a victorious Hector (275), but only to stress the actual misery of his ultimate degradation. We know that Romans preferred to remember their dead in their most glorious form;[1] Virgil takes advantage of such expectations in order to frustrate them and move his readers more deeply.

The contrast of emotions helps us to understand Aeneas. Intimately connected with Troy as he is, at this point he cannot feel anything but grief. But, a possible transfiguration of his grief into the hopeful belief in a new future is cautiously prepared for by the Hector apparition. The fact that Virgil, at the beginning of the scene, enlarges upon Aeneas' grief allows the reader to sympathize with the hero and not to misinterpret his flight as cold and heartless cowardice.

Let us now turn to theme 4: "Most piteous events I saw with my own eyes / and played no minor part in"[2] *quaeque ipse miserrima uidi / et quorum pars magna fui* (2. 5-6). This sentence could be spoken by Hector with still more truth than by Aeneas; had Hector not fought for Troy and suffered many wounds around the walls of his city (278-279)? Virgil here emphasizes Hector's identification with Troy by introducing the post-Homeric idea of his being dragged around the walls. By mentioning these sad facts and putting them into the proper light, Virgil clandestinely prepares for his main purpose in this scene. Troy's most successful military hero, Hector, is the representative of Troy, and it is in this role that he will talk to Aeneas. However, before coming to his point, Virgil inserts the dreamy reactions and ignorant questions of Aeneas as an element of suspense; note the impressionistic lack of contours in the combination of the imperfect and infinitives (279-280): *uidebar compellare ... expromere.* This specific use of verb forms evokes Ennius' dream of Ilia (*Ann.* 41-43), a later stage in the history of the naissance of Rome. In the words he addresses to Hector, the dreamer seems to have forgotten that Hector is dead, a phenomenon of the dream-state, that distortion of reality which Virgil's readers may have experienced themselves. Then Aeneas

---

[1] At Roman funerals the ancestors were represented in the attire of the highest office they had performed.

[2] Translation: C.Day Lewis (Oxford, 1952; paperback: New York, 1953).

stresses once more the themes 2, 3, and 4; a contrast is provided by the Trojan's joy at Hector's unexpected come-back (cf. *lux* and *spes* 281). Though Aeneas seems to cherish some illusionary hopes, he rightly suppresses the fact that the Trojans depend completely on Hector (theme 4). This idea prepares the main argument of the scene (which will justify Aeneas' flight). Aeneas' questions demonstrate two things: first, the hero does not try to cut a favourable figure and pretend to be more cunning than he is; second, all of his questions arise from his visceral love of and deep concern for Troy. The question "Why do I behold these wounds?" *cur haec uulnera cerno* (286), seemingly another of Aeneas' futile questions, actually strikes a new chord (theme 3): Aeneas is asking for an explanation of his vision.

Hector's Authoritative Answer

Hector, however, does not react to the dreamer's questions; instead he goes *medias in res* and, in a deep sigh, urges Aeneas to leave Troy. Aeneas, however, will not react immediately to this appeal, a hesitation which again shows his deep involvement with his city. Instead of answering Aeneas' questions, Hector, not unlike Tityrus in the *First Eclogue,* puts everything into a new dimension; without any preparation he introduces a theme which had been hitherto intentionally suppressed by Virgil, the theme of flight (theme 6), which is essential to the whole book. For ordering him to leave Troy, Aeneas could not have found a better authority than Hector, who gave his life for his city. By introducing the motive with *heu,* which is not the hortatory interjection, *heus,* but a woeful sigh, Virgil assures us that Hector understands how deeply Aeneas must be hurt by the bitter truth that flight is inevitable. A similar effect is produced when Hector addresses Aeneas as the son of the goddess, *nate dea,* a phrase which shows his respect for Aeneas' heroic dignity. In fact, Aeneas' mother Venus will be the next authority to urge him into flight (519), though with no more success than Hector. Only the third appeal, which will come from his father Anchises (733), will be immediately obeyed by Aeneas.

Hector then gives an especially pertinent justification for Aeneas' flight: it is necessary not in order to save Aeneas' life, but to save the gods of the city. Thus—and this is a master-stroke—abandoning Troy becomes the highest form of loyalty to Troy. Now the old city is called

hae flammae, but this harsh realism is even surpassed in the following sentence, which without cynicism can only be pronounced by Hector, the most faithful defender of his country, "Enough has been given to our country and to Priam" *sat patriae Priamoque datum* (291). In this vision, there emerge thoughts which Aeneas, when awake, would not allow himself. In classical antiquity a citizen fights for his *polis*; his personal commitment to the king is a sacred obligation. In reality Aeneas will carry his devotion further than Hector suggests. Only after Priam's death will Aeneas feel free, not to leave Troy, but to care for his own family. In this way, Hector's speech provides a dark foil against which Aeneas' actual behaviour, his devotion to king and country, will look all the more glorious.[1] The crucial point of Virgil's invention in Book 2 was to have Hector, not Aeneas pronounce the most shocking truths.

Even more revealing is the continuation of the scene. In fact, Hector does not stop short with the negative statement that Troy cannot be saved physically; he even commends the gods of the city to Aeneas who must take them with him on his path marked by destiny. Hector illustrates his order by a symbolic action: he carries the sacred objects and the eternal fire out of the shrine, showing that, in this desperate case, paradoxically, a new start is the only way of saving the tradition, provided that *pietas* is maintained. Both the Trojan attachment to the city and its gods will persist in Aeneas and will be re-born in a future city.

Ennius in his dream had used Homer as the best possible authority to confirm his claim to be the new Homer. Similarly Aeneas in a dream-scene is legitimated by Hector personally as his heir. He will preserve the patterns of behaviour proper to the sacred *polis* destroyed by Greek individualism and to be re-established by the Romans.

The Hector Dream as Compared to the Introductory Lines of Book 2

The Hector scene sheds some unexpected light on Virgil's use of the categories initially mentioned.

---

[1] F.Cairns does not seem to take into account the fact that Aeneas, by his narrative, justifies his flight rather than his kingship. His battle is dominated by *furor* and *ira.* In the present part of Book 2, loyalty, not bravery is the important issue (*Virgil's Augustan Epic* [Cambridge, 1989]: 38-39).

1. As son of Troy and Anchises and father of Ascanius and the Romans, Aeneas embodies *pietas* which is correct behaviour towards past and future generations. To save him from an excessive and suicidal attachment to the past, Hector through words and action redefines *pietas* to show him his obligation to the future.

2. Aeneas' grief is too deep to be easily transformed into joy, but Hector tries to replace despair with hope.

3. Aeneas is an eye-witness both to Troy's death and to the divine signs pointing to a future rebirth. He diligently "reads" the signs (which is an important aspect of what the Romans called *religio*, "careful reading", as Cicero[1] puts it).

4. *Et quorum pars magna fui*; Aeneas to a high degree identifies himself with Troy. The perfect tense is significant: Aeneas talks almost as if he were dead. As a matter of fact, he left there his home, his spouse, his youth, his heroism, all of his private existence. As the whole of Book 2 shows, he desperately and repeatedly tried to die for and with his country. Yet death did not accept him and now he lives only for his mission.

Let us now turn to the themes not mentioned in the introduction.

5. The wily behaviour of the Greek Sinon, to whom nothing is sacred, forms a telling contrast to Aeneas' correctness (theme 1) and his humanity (theme 2). When the Trojans try to deceive the deceivers, the *spolia* betray them (386-430; cf. 2. 274; 9. 373). Another motif contrary to Aeneas' *pietas* is the reckless character of Neoptolemus (2. 535-553). Both of these aspects are not even mentioned in Aeneas' dream of Hector. They would have destroyed the dignified brevity of the scene.

6. Most important, however, the theme of flight, which had been purposely avoided in the introduction, although it is essential to the whole book, is suddenly introduced by Hector. His harsh and unsparing language provides a background against which Aeneas' later actions appear exceedingly correct and virtuous. The application of such techniques is part of Aeneas' rhetorical strategy in telling the story of his flight. This is not fabrication, but it helps the truth to win out, which is the aim of all good rhetoric. Rhetorically speaking,

---

[1] Cicero, *Nat. Deor.* 2. 72. The correct etymology, however, is perhaps ἀλέγω (A.Walde, J.B.Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 4th ed. 1965), vol. 1: 352-353; H.Petersmann, "Eusebeia, Threskeia and *religio*. An Etymological Analysis of Three Disputed Terms", *Linguistica* 33 (1993): 177-186.

it was the narrator's task to dissociate flight from cowardice and instead to associate flight with virtue. This becomes possible by having the motif introduced by Hector's authority, by combining flight with a patriotic mission, and by having Aeneas not follow Hector's radical advice at once, but behave hyper-correctly, even in terms of the heroic code.

Epilogue: In the case of Aeneas' account of his flight, both the speaker's situation and the form chosen by the author call for a rhetorical interpretation. This is not only true of the *inuentio* of his tactics of self-justification, but also of the deeply emotional *elocutio* which makes the reader understand that it was precisely during this narrative that Dido fell in love with Aeneas. By this "rhetorical" approach, we do not pretend to give an exhaustive account of the Second Book of the *Aeneid*. Suffice it to say that this aspect ought not to be neglected any longer, since Virgil submits rhetoric to the aims of his great poem with equal skill as he does all other resources of literary technique.

As for intertextual references (in the narrower sense of the word), we are not in a position to give a reliable account of Virgil's relationship to lost models (*Posthomerica*). All the more interesting is his appeal to his readers' knowledge of old Latin tragedy. These reminiscences enhance the emotional impact of Aeneas' narrative and, at the same time, the dignity of its style. On the more abstract level of intercultural relationships, in the 2nd Book, "Roman" virtues like *pietas* and *fides* are deliberately opposed to the lies and wiles of the Greeks. This is not Virgil's last word (consider the fusion of Greek and Roman elements as propounded, for instance, in the Sicilian episodes of Books 3 and 5), but it greatly contributes to the *auctoritas* of Aeneas as narrator and to his winning ways (*ethos*) which would conquer Dido's heart.

3. Inuentio I: *Virgil's View of History in the Catalogue of Heroes* Aeneid *6. 679-899*[1]

At pater Anchises penitus conualle uirenti
inclusas animas superumque ad lumen ituras
lustrabat studio recolens, omnemque suorum
forte recensebat numerum, carosque nepotes
fataque fortunasque uirum moresque manusque.
isque ubi tendentem aduersum per gramina uidit
Aenean, alacris palmas utrasque tetendit,
effusaeque genis lacrimae et uox excidit ore:
'uenisti tandem, tuaque exspectata parenti
uicit iter durum pietas? datur ora tueri,
nate, tua et notas audire et reddere uoces?
sic equidem ducebam animo rebarque futurum
tempora dinumerans, nec me mea cura fefellit.
quas ego te terras et quanta per aequora uectum
accipio! quantis iactatum, nate, periclis!
quam metui ne quid Libyae tibi regna nocerent!'
ille autem: 'tua me, genitor, tua tristis imago
saepius occurrens haec limina tendere adegit;
stant sale Tyrrheno classes. da iungere dextram,
da, genitor, teque amplexu ne subtrahe nostro.'
sic memorans largo fletu simul ora rigabat.
ter conatus ibi collo dare bracchia circum;
ter frustra comprensa manus effugit imago,
par leuibus uentis uolucrique simillima somno.
   Interea uidet Aeneas in ualle reducta
seclusum nemus et uirgulta sonantia siluae,
Lethaeumque domos placidas qui praenatat amnem.
hunc circum innumerae gentes populique uolabant:
ac ueluti in pratis ubi apes aestate serena
floribus insidunt uariis et candida circum
lilia funduntur, strepit omnis murmure campus.
horrescit uisu subito causasque requirit
inscius Aeneas, quae sint ea flumina porro,
quiue uiri tanto complerint agmine ripas.
tum pater Anchises: 'animae, quibus altera fato
corpora debentur, Lethaei ad fluminis undam
securos latices et longa obliuia potant.
has equidem memorare tibi atque ostendere coram
iampridem, hanc prolem cupio enumerare meorum,
quo magis Italia mecum laetere reperta.'
'o pater, anne aliquas ad caelum hinc ire putandum est
sublimis animas iterumque ad tarda reuerti

[1] Text: R.A.B.Mynors (Oxford, 1969); translation: C.Day Lewis (London, 1952; paperback: New York, 1953).

corpora? quae lucis miseris tam dira cupido?'
'dicam equidem nec te suspensum, nate, tenebo'
suscipit Anchises atque ordine singula pandit.
'Principio caelum ac terras camposque liquentis
lucentemque globum lunae Titaniaque astra
spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus
mens agitat molem et magno se corpore miscet.
inde hominum pecudumque genus uitaeque uolantum
et quae marmoreo fert monstra sub aequore pontus.
igneus est ollis uigor et caelestis origo
seminibus, quantum non noxia corpora tardant
terrenique hebetant artus moribundaque membra.
hinc metuunt cupiuntque, dolent gaudentque, neque auras
dispiciunt clausae tenebris et carcere caeco.
quin et supremo cum lumine uita reliquit,
non tamen omne malum miseris nec funditus omnes
corporeae excedunt pestes, penitusque necesse est
multa diu concreta modis inolescere miris.
ergo exercentur poenis ueterumque malorum
supplicia expendunt: aliae panduntur inanes
suspensae ad uentos, aliis sub gurgite uasto
infectum eluitur scelus aut exuritur igni
(quisque suos patimur manis; exinde per amplum
mittimur Elysium et pauci laeta arua tenemus),
donec longa dies perfecto temporis orbe
concretam exemit labem, purumque relinquit
aetherium sensum atque aurai simplicis ignem.
has omnis, ubi mille rotam uoluere per annos,
Lethaeum ad fluuium deus euocat agmine magno,
scilicet immemores supera ut conuexa reuisant
rursus, et incipiant in corpora uelle reuerti.'
Dixerat Anchises natumque unaque Sibyllam
conuentus trahit in medios turbamque sonantem,
et tumulum capit unde omnis longo ordine posset
aduersos legere et uenientum discere uultus.
'Nunc age, Dardaniam prolem quae deinde sequatur
gloria, qui maneant Itala de gente nepotes,
inlustris animas nostrumque in nomen ituras,
expediam dictis, et te tua fata docebo.
ille, uides, pura iuuenis qui nititur hasta,
proxima sorte tenet lucis loca, primus ad auras
aetherias Italo commixtus sanguine surget,
Siluius, Albanum nomen, tua postuma proles,
quem tibi longaeuo serum Lauinia coniunx
educet siluis regem regumque parentem,
unde genus Longa nostrum dominabitur Alba.
proximus ille Procas, Troianae gloria gentis,
et Capys et Numitor et qui te nomine reddet
Siluius Aeneas, pariter pietate uel armis
egregius, si umquam regnandam acceperit Albam.

qui iuuenes! quantas ostentant, aspice, uiris
atque umbrata gerunt ciuili tempora quercu!
hi tibi Nomentum et Gabios urbemque Fidenam,
hi Collatinas imponent montibus arces,
Pometios Castrumque Inui Bolamque Coramque;
haec tum nomina erunt, nunc sunt sine nomine terrae.
quin et auo comitem sese Mauortius addet
Romulus, Assaraci quem sanguinis Ilia mater
educet. uiden, ut geminae stant uertice cristae
et pater ipse suo superum iam signat honore?
en huius, nate, auspiciis illa incluta Roma
imperium terris, animos aequabit Olympo,
septemque una sibi muro circumdabit arces,
felix prole uirum: qualis Berecyntia mater
inuehitur curru Phrygias turrita per urbes
laeta deum partu, centum complexa nepotes,
omnis caelicolas, omnis supera alta tenentis.
huc geminas nunc flecte acies, hanc aspice gentem
Romanosque tuos. hic Caesar et omnis Iuli
progenies magnum caeli uentura sub axem.
hic uir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis,
Augustus Caesar, Diui genus, aurea condet
saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arua
Saturno quondam, super et Garamantas et Indos
proferet imperium; iacet extra sidera tellus,
extra anni solisque uias, ubi caelifer Atlas
axem umero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum.
huius in aduentum iam nunc et Caspia regna
responsis horrent diuum et Maeotia tellus,
et septemgemini turbant trepida ostia Nili.
nec uero Alcides tantum telluris obiuit,
fixerit aeripedem ceruam licet, aut Erymanthi
pacarit nemora et Lernam tremefecerit arcu;
nec qui pampineis uictor iuga flectit habenis
Liber, agens celso Nysae de uertice tigris.
et dubitamus adhuc uirtutem extendere factis,
aut metus Ausonia prohibet consistere terra?
quis procul ille autem ramis insignis oliuae
sacra ferens? nosco crinis incanaque menta
regis Romani primam qui legibus urbem
fundabit Curibus paruis et paupere terra,
missus in imperium magnum. cui deinde subibit
otia qui rumpet patriae residesque mouebit
Tullus in arma uiros et iam desueta triumphis
agmina. quem iuxta sequitur iactantior Ancus
nunc quoque iam nimium gaudens popularibus auris.
uis et Tarquinios reges animamque superbam
ultoris Bruti, fascisque uidere receptos?
consulis imperium hic primus saeuasque securis
accipiet, natosque pater noua bella mouentis

ad poenam pulchra pro libertate uocabit,
infelix, utcumque ferent ea facta minores:
uincet amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido.
quin Decios Drusosque procul saeuumque securi
aspice Torquatum et referentem signa Camillum.
illae autem paribus quas fulgere cernis in armis,
concordes animae nunc et dum nocte prementur,
heu quantum inter se bellum, si lumina uitae
attigerint, quantas acies stragemque ciebunt,
aggeribus socer Alpinis atque arce Monoeci
descendens, gener aduersis instructus Eois!
ne, pueri, ne tanta animis adsuescite bella
neu patriae ualidas in uiscera uertite uiris;
tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo,
proice tela manu, sanguis meus! -
ille triumphata Capitolia ad alta Corintho
uictor aget currum caesis insignis Achiuis.
eruet ille Argos Agamemnoniasque Mycenas
ipsumque Aeaciden, genus armipotentis Achilli,
ultus auos Troiae templa et temerata Mineruae.
quis te, magne Cato, tacitum aut te, Cosse, relinquat?
quis Gracchi genus aut geminos, duo fulmina belli,
Scipiadas, cladem Libyae, paruoque potentem
Fabricium uel te sulco, Serrane, serentem?
quo fessum rapitis, Fabii? tu Maximus ille es,
unus qui nobis cunctando restituis rem.
excudent alii spirantia mollius aera
(credo equidem), uiuos ducent de marmore uultus,
orabunt causas melius, caelique meatus
describent radio et surgentia sidera dicent:
tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
(hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem,
parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.'
    Sic pater Anchises, atque haec mirantibus addit:
'aspice, ut insignis spoliis Marcellus opimis
ingreditur uictorque uiros supereminet omnis.
hic rem Romanam magno turbante tumultu
sistet eques, sternet Poenos Gallumque rebellem,
tertiaque arma patri suspendet capta Quirino.'
atque hic Aeneas (una namque ire uidebat
egregium forma iuuenem et fulgentibus armis,
sed frons laeta parum et deiecto lumina uultu)
'quis, pater, ille, uirum qui sic comitatur euntem?
filius, anne aliquis magna de stirpe nepotum?
qui strepitus circa comitum! quantum instar in ipso!
sed nox atra caput tristi circumuolat umbra.'
tum pater Anchises lacrimis ingressus obortis:
'o gnate, ingentem luctum ne quaere tuorum;
ostendent terris hunc tantum fata nec ultra
esse sinent. nimium uobis Romana propago

uisa potens, superi, propria haec si dona fuissent.
quantos ille uirum magnam Mauortis ad urbem
campus aget gemitus! uel quae, Tiberine, uidebis
funera, cum tumulum praeterlabere recentem!
nec puer Iliaca quisquam de gente Latinos
in tantum spe tollet auos, nec Romula quondam
ullo se tantum tellus iactabit alumno.
heu pietas, heu prisca fides inuictaque bello
dextera! non illi se quisquam impune tulisset
obuius armato, seu cum pedes iret in hostem
seu spumantis equi foderet calcaribus armos.
heu, miserande puer, si qua fata aspera rumpas,
tu Marcellus eris. manibus date lilia plenis
purpureos spargam flores animamque nepotis
his saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani
munere.' sic tota passim regione uagantur
aëris in campis latis atque omnia lustrant.
quae postquam Anchises natum per singula duxit
incenditque animum famae uenientis amore,
exim bella uiro memorat quae deinde gerenda,
Laurentisque docet populos urbemque Latini,
et quo quemque modo fugiatque feratque laborem.
Sunt geminae Somni portae, quarum altera fertur
cornea, qua ueris facilis datur exitus umbris,
altera candenti perfecta nitens elephanto,
sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia Manes.
his ubi tum natum Anchises unaque Sibyllam
prosequitur dictis portaque emittit eburna,
ille uiam secat ad nauis sociosque reuisit.

Deep in a green valley stood father Anchises, surveying / the spirits there confined before they went up to the light of (680) / the world above: he was musing seriously, and reviewing / his folk's full tally, it happened, the line of his loved children, / their destinies and fortunes, their characters and their deeds. / Now, when he saw Aeneas coming in his direction / over the grass, he stretched out both hands, all eagerness, (685) / and tears poured down his cheeks, and the words were tumbling out:—/ So you have come at last? The love that your father relied on / has won through the hard journey? And I may gaze, my son, / upon your face, and exchange the old homely talk with you? / Thus indeed I surmised it would be, believed it must happen, (690) / counting the days till you came: I was not deceived in my hopes, then. / Over what lands, what wide, wide seas you have made your journey! / What dangers, my son, have beset you! And now you are here with me. / How I dreaded lest you should come to some harm at Carthage! / Aeneas replied:—Your image it was, your troubled phantom (695) / that, often rising before me, has brought me to this place, father. / Our ships are riding at anchor in the Tyrrhene sea. Oh, let me / take your hand and embrace you, father! Let me! Withdraw not! / Even as he spoke, his cheeks grew wet with a flood of tears. / Three times he tried to put his arms round his father's neck, (700) / three times the phantom slipped his

vain embrace—it was like / grasping a wisp of wind or the wings of a fleeting dream. / Now did Aeneas descry, deep in a valley retiring, / a wood, a secluded copse whose branches soughed in the wind, / and Lethe river drifting past the tranquil places. (705) / Hereabouts were flitting a multitude without number, / just as, amid the meadows on a fine summer day, / the bees alight on flowers of every hue, and brim the / shining lilies, and all the lea is humming with them. / Aeneas, moved by the sudden sight, asked in his ignorance (710) / what it might mean, what was that river over there / and all that crowd of people swarming along its banks. / Then his father, Anchises, said:—They are souls who are destined for / reincarnation; and now at Lethe's stream they are drinking / the waters that quench man's troubles, the deep draught of oblivion. (715) / Long, long have I wanted to tell you of these and reveal them / before your eyes, to count them over, the seed of my seed, / that you might the more rejoice with me in the finding of Italy. / But, father, must it be deemed that some souls ascend from here / to our earthly scene? re-enter our dull corporeal existence? (720) / Why ever should so perverse a craving for earth possess them? / I will tell you, my son, certainly; I will not keep you in doubt, / answered Anchises, and then enlarged on each point successively:—/ First, you must know that the heavens, the earth, the watery plains / of the sea, the moon's bright globe, the sun and the stars are all (725) / sustained by a spirit within; for immanent Mind, flowing / through all its parts and leavening its mass, makes the universe work. / This unison produced mankind, the beasts, the birds of the air, / and the strange creatures that live under the sea's smooth face. / The life-force of those seeds is fire, their source celestial, (730) / but they are deadened and dimmed by the sinful bodies they live in—/ the flesh is laden with death, the anatomy of clay: / whence these souls of ours feel fear, desire, grief, joy, / but encased in their blind, dark prison discern not the heaven-light above. / Yes, not even when the last flicker of life has left us, (735) / does evil, or the ills that flesh is heir to, quite / relinquish our souls; it must be that many a taint grows deeply, / mysteriously grained in their being from long contact with the body. / Therefore the dead are disciplined in purgatory, and pay / the penalty of old evil: some hang, stretched to the blast of (740) / vacuum winds; for others, the stain of sin is washed / away in a vast whirlpool or cauterised with fire. / Each of us finds in the next world his own level: a few of us / are later released to wander at will through broad Elysium, / the Happy Fields; until, in the fullness of time, the ages (745) / have purged that ingrown stain, and nothing is left but pure / ethereal sentience and the spirit's essential flame. / All these souls, when they have finished their thousand-year cycle, / god sends for, and they come in crowds to the river of Lethe, / so that, you see, with memory washed out, they may revisit (750) / the earth above and begin to wish to be born again. / When Anchises had finished, he drew his son and the Sibyl / into the thick of the murmuring concourse assembled there / and took his stand on an eminence from which he could scan the long files / over against him, and mark the features of those who passed. (755) / Listen, for I will show you your destiny, setting forth / the fame that from now shall attend the seed of Dardanus, / the posterity that awaits you from an Italian marriage—/ illustrious souls, one day to come in for our Trojan name. / That young man there—do you see him? who leans on an untipped

spear, (760) / has been allotted the next passage to life, and first of / all these will ascend to earth, with Italian blood in his veins; / he is Silvius, an Alban name, and destined to be your last child, / the child of your late old age by a wife, Lavinia, who shall / bear him in sylvan surroundings, a king and the father of kings (765) / through whom our lineage shall rule in Alba Longa. / Next to him stands Procas, a glory to the Trojan line; / then Capys and Numitor, and one who'll revive your own name—/ Silvius Aeneas, outstanding alike for moral rectitude / and prowess in warfare, if ever he comes to the Alban throne. (770) / What fine young men they are! Look at their stalwart bearing, / the oak leaves that shade their brows—decorations for saving life! / These shall found your Nomentum, Gabii and Fidenae, / these shall rear on the hills Collatia's citadel, / Pometii, and the Fort of Inuus, Bola and Cora—(775) / all nameless sites at present, but then they shall have these names. / Further, a child of Mars shall go to join his grandsire—/ Romulus, born of the stock of Assaracus by his mother, / Ilia. Look at the twin plumes upon his helmet's crest, / Mars' cognisance, which marks him out for the world of earth! (780) / His are the auguries, my son, whereby great Rome / shall rule to the ends of the earth, shall aspire to the highest achievement, / shall ring the seven hills with a wall to make one city, / blessed in her breed of men: as Cybele, wearing her turreted / crown, is charioted round the Phrygian cities, proud of (785) / her brood of gods, embracing a hundred of her children's children—/ heaven-dwellers all, all tenants of the realm avove. / Now bend your gaze this way, look at that people there! / They are *your* Romans. Caesar is there and all Ascanius' / posterity, who shall pass beneath the arch of day. (790) / And here, here is the man, the promised one you know of—/ Caesar Augustus, son of a god, destined to rule / where Saturn ruled of old in Latium, and there / bring back the age of gold: his empire shall expand / past Garamants and Indians to a land beyond the zodiac (795) / and the sun's yearly path, where Atlas the sky-bearer pivots / the wheeling heavens, embossed with fiery stars, on his shoulder. / Even now the Caspian realm, the Crimean country / tremble at oracles of the gods predicting his advent, / and the seven mouths of the Nile are in a lather of fright. (800) / Not even Hercules roved so far and wide over earth, / although he shot the bronze-footed deer, brought peace to the woods of / Erymanthus, subdued Lerna with the terror of his bow; / nor Bacchus, triumphantly driving his team with vines for reins, / his team of tigers down from Mount Nysa, travelled so far. (805) / Do we still hesitate, then, to enlarge our courage by action? / Shrink from occupying the territory of Ausonia? / Who is that in the distance, bearing the hallows, crowned with / a wreath of olive? I recognise—grey hair and hoary chin—/ that Roman king who, called to high power from humble Cures, (810) / a town in a poor area, shall found our system of law / and thus refound our city. The successor of Numa, destined / to shake our land out of its indolence, stirring men up to fight / who have grown unadventurous and lost the habit of victory, / is Tullus. After him shall reign the too boastful Ancus, (815) / already over-fond of the breath of popular favour. / Would you see the Tarquin kings, and arrogant as they, Brutus / the avenger, with the symbols of civic freedom he won back? / He shall be first to receive consular rank and its power of / life and death: when his sons awake the dormant conflict, (820) / their father, a tragic figure,

shall call them to pay the extreme / penalty, for fair freedom's sake. However posterity / look on that deed, patriotism shall prevail and love of / honour. See over there the Decii, the Drusi, Torquatus / with merciless axe, Camillus with the standards he recovered. (825) / See those twin souls, resplendent in duplicate armour: now / they're of one mind, and shall be as long as the Underworld holds them; / but oh, if ever they reach the world above, what warfare, / what battles and what carnage will they create between them—/ Caesar descending from Alpine strongholds, the fort of Monoecus, (830) / his son-in-law Pompey lined up with an Eastern army against him. / Lads, do not harden yourselves to face such terrible wars! / Turn not your country's hand against your country's heart! / You, be the first to renounce it, my son of heavenly lineage, / you be the first to bury the hatchet!... (835) / That one shall ride in triumph to the lofty Capitol, / the conqueror of Corinth, renowned for the Greeks he has slain. / That one shall wipe out Argos and Agamemnon's Mycenae, / destroying an heir of Aeacus, the seed of warrior Achilles, / avenging his Trojan sires and the sacrilege done to Minerva. (840) / Who could leave unnoticed the glorious Cato, Cossus, / the family of the Gracchi, the two Scipios—thunderbolts / in war and death to Libya; Fabricius, who had plenty / in poverty; Serranus, sowing his furrowed fields? / Fabii, where do you lead my lagging steps? O Fabius, (845) / the greatest, you the preserver of Rome by delaying tactics! / Let others fashion from bronze more lifelike, breathing images—/ for so they shall—and evoke living faces from marble; / others excel as orators, others track with their instruments / the planets circling in heaven and predict when stars will appear. (850) / But, Romans, never forget that government is your medium! / Be this your art:—to practise men in the habit of peace, / generosity to the conquered, and firmness against aggressors. / They marvelled at Anchises' words, and he went on:—/ Look how Marcellus comes all glorious with the highest (855) / of trophies, a victor over-topping all other men! / He shall buttress the Roman cause when a great war shakes it, / shatter the Carthaginian and rebel Gaul with his cavalry, / give to Quirinus the third set of arms won in single combat. / Aeneas interposed, seeing beside Marcellus (860) / a youth of fine appearance, in glittering accoutrements, / but his face was far from cheerful and downcast were his eyes:—/ Father, who is he that walks with Marcellus there? / His son? Or one of the noble line of his children's children? / How the retinue murmurs around him! How fine is the young man's presence! (865) / Yet is his head haloed by sombre shade of night. / Then father Anchises began, tears welling up in his eyes:—/ My son, do not probe into the sorrows of your kin. / Fate shall allow the earth one glimpse of this young man—/ one glimpse, no more. Too puissant had been Rome's stock, ye gods, (870) / in your sight, had such gifts been granted it to keep. / What lamentations of men shall the Campus Martius echo / to Mars' great city! O Tiber, what obsequies you shall see / one day as you glide past the new-built mausoleum! / No lad of the Trojan line shall with such hopeful promise (875) / exalt his Latin forebeaars, nor shall the land of Romulus / ever again be so proud of one she has given birth to. / Alas for the sense of duty, the old-time honour! Alas for / the hand unvanquished in war! Him would no foe have met / in battle and not rued it, whether he charged on foot (880) / or drove his lathering steed with

spurs against the enemy. / Alas, poor youth! If only you could escape your harsh fate! / Marcellus you shall be. Give me armfuls of lilies / that I may scatter their shining blooms and shower these gifts / at least upon the dear soul, all to no purpose though (885) / such kindness be. So far and wide, surveying all, / they wandered through that region, those broad and hazy plains. / After Anchises had shown his son over the whole place / and fired his heart with passion for the great things to come, / he told the hero of wars he would have to fight one day, / told of the Laurentines and the city of Latinus, / and how to evade, or endure, each crisis upon his way. / There are two gates of Sleep: the one is made of horn, / they say, and affords the outlet for genuine apparitions: / the other's a gate of brightly-shining ivory; this way (895) / the shades send up to earth false dreams that impose upon us. / Talking, then, of such matters, Anchises escorted his son / and the Sibyl as far as the ivory gate and sent them through it. / Aeneas made his way back to the ships and his friends with all speed.

More studies have been devoted to Virgil's general view of history[1] than to detailed interpretations of individual texts (except for the *Fourth Eclogue*), which might shed light on how, in a given context, Virgil relates to certain facts and aspects of Roman history and on what meaning he extracts from these facts. It is our intention not to start from abstract ideas nor to systematize them; instead, we would like to follow Virgil on his way as he discovers the driving forces behind Roman history. Since Virgil's manner of assimilating Roman history and, as it were, living with it is that of a poet, not of a philosopher, the way the poet comes to his ideas might prove even more revealing than the ideas themselves. In fact, ideas tend to become static and immobilized when put into a philosophical system, but reveal all of their intrinsic dynamism and liveliness when captured

---

1 The present chapter is dedicated to Albin Lesky. It is based on my Heidelberg inaugural lecture and on my article "Vergils Geschichtsauffassung in der 'Heldenschau'", *WS* 80, n.s. 1(1967): 156-182. See further: K.Navratil, "Die Geschichtsphilosophie der Aeneis", *WS* 57 (1939): 113-128. R.Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*, (Darmstadt, 1957 = 1914): 471-493; English edition: *Virgil's Epic Technique.* Transl. by H. and D.Harvey, and F.Robertson, with a preface by A.Wlosok (London, 1993). F.Klingner, "Virgil und die geschichtliche Welt", in: Römische Geisteswelt[3], (Munich, 1956): 275-293. W.Iwanow, "Virgil's Historiosophie", in: *Wege zu Vergil* (Darmstadt, 1963): 220-232. P.R.Hardie, *Cosmos and Imperium*, Oxford 1985, esp. Chapters 1-4 and 8 (5-157; 336-377). On the "catalogue of heroes" see especially Norden's Commentary (1957), and Heinze, *op. cit.*: 442-444; also, H.Belling, *Studien über die Compositionskunst Vergils*, (Leipzig, 1899): 18. T.Adamik, "Die Struktur und Funktion des sechsten Buches der Äneis, *AAntHung* 35 (1994): 107-115; J.Penwill, *Two Essays on Virgil. Intertextual Issues in Aeneid 6 and Georgics 4* (Bendigo, 1995). On Virgil's attitude towards history see G.N.Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer* (Göttingen, 1964). For a comparison of our passage with the Roman funeral procession, E.Skard, "Die Heldenschau in Virgils Aeneis", *SO* 40 (1965): 53-65.

in a piece of poetry. Let us first follow the text of the "catalogue of heroes", then describe Virgil's approach to it.

The Setting: Summer Imagery

Having set forth his "eschatological" views, Anchises leads Aeneas and the Sibyl among the throng of heroes to be born (752-753). For Aeneas, this creates a new closeness to his descendants as he is now able to distinguish individual faces (755). Virgil had long since begun to prepare his reader for this moment; twice the catalogue of heroes seemed to be near, twice the poet created suspense by postponing the scene. First we had seen Anchises surveying the future seed of men (not unlike Laertes in his orchard: *Aen.* 6. 679-683; cf. *Od.* 24. 226). Then after the moving scene of welcome, which is a focal point of Book 6[1], the souls are viewed again, this time without Anchises. As the bee simile shows (706-709), Aeneas visualizes the heroes as a group, not yet as individuals, and, overwhelmed with the vision, must ask for an explanation. Anchises explicitly announces the catalogue of heroes (710-718). Once more, however, the revelation is postponed, because Anchises first must answer Aeneas' question why the souls wish to return to earth (719-721). As a result, the gallery of Roman heroes (756-886) is the finale of the encounter between father and son which, in its turn, is the finale to Book 6. The initial particle *nunc* (756)[2] stresses that the long expected moment has finally come.[3]

As in the teichoscopy of the *Iliad* (3. 154-244),[4] the observers ascend to a higher point to have a bird's eye view (754-755). There is not an inconsistency proper, but a calculated interplay between proximity and distance in this scene: on the one hand, the clear disposition of the whole suits the bird's-eye view; on the other hand, the seemingly random emergence of individual heroes chimes with

---

1 Anchises has a double role, as prophet and as father. In this respect, he combines the functions of Anticlea and of Teiresias.

2 For a rhetorical character of *nunc*, see Norden, *op. cit.*, 312.

3 Norden has understood the overall structure more correctly than Boyancé. For Norden the important stress rests in the catalogue of heroes; according to him (*op. cit.*, 46), the general revelation (5. 724-751) concerning reincarnation is not a goal in itself, but a means to introduce the panorama of heroes. Boyancé stresses the religious importance of that apocalyptic passage: P.Boyancé, *La religion de Virgile* (Paris, 1963): 174.

4 The analogies with the teichoscopy go further than has been noticed until now; see now S.Grebe, *Die vergilische Heldenschau. Tradition und Fortwirken* (Frankfurt, 1989): 17-73.

the closeness of Aeneas to the group. The introduction of Anchises' speech, which comprises four lines (756-759),[1] is oriented towards the future (cf. *deinde sequatur; maneant; ituras*) and glory (*gloria; inlustris*). This joyous atmosphere, which is in deliberate contrast to the Homeric Anticlea scene,[2] is stressed by Virgil at the beginning and at the end (685; 718; 889); the vision of the future will ultimately inject new power into Aeneas. The green landscape (679; 703-709) and the summertime bustle of humming bees are suggestive of the rise of a blissful future as opposed to the images of fall and winter which had accompanied the descent of Aeneas and of the spirits (309-312).[3] A key word of Anchises' introduction is *nomen*, and we shall have to come back to the idea of the spirits "entering" into the name of Anchises and Aeneas. Finally, the father promises to reveal his son's future, a promise which will be briefly fulfilled (890-892). Since there had been a similar prophecy of the Sibyl (83-97), scholars have assumed that Virgil meant to delete lines 890-892,[4] yet the *propositio* of Anchises explicitly announces these lines ("And I will teach you your fate" *et te tua fata docebo*). It was necessary to mention Aeneas' own future after the catalogue of heroes since the detailed knowledge of the future of his race must shed new light on Aeneas' hardships in Books 7-12 and make him more willing to endure them. Only the mention of the hero's personal destiny fully explains why the catabasis and the catalogue of heroes are placed before the beginning of the war in Latium.[5]

Kings and Founders

The first part of the catalogue (760-807) is opened by Silvius, the future son of Aeneas and Lavinia, whose birth is the final cause of the war described in the second half of the *Aeneid*. The fundamental

---

[1] I do not agree with Belling (*op. cit.*): 118, who relates *inlustris animas nostrumque in nomen ituras* only to the heroes of section two.

[2] *Od.* 11. 152-224 (whereupon the catalogue of women follows). For the contrast of moods, see G.Funaioli, *L'oltretomba nell'Eneide di Virgilio* (Palermo-Rome, 1924): 113-117.

[3] M.von Duhn, *Die Gleichnisse in den ersten sechs Büchern von Virgils Aeneis* (diss. Hamburg, 1952): 147-150. The contrast of moods between descent and ascent is stressed by parellels in structure.

[4] Heinze, *op.cit.*, 360, 1; 440; Norden (*op.cit.*, 346-347). Lines 890-892 are not as empty and meaningless as A.B.Drachmann thought, *NTF* 13 (1904-1905): 128-129.

[5] Clearly understood by Silius Italicus; cf. 13. 503-504, *disce, puer, quoniam cognoscere cordi est / iam tua deque tuis pendentia Dardana fatis.*

importance of the paragraph devoted to Silvius is stressed by its very length (760-766).

In four lines (767-770) there follows a motley group of other Alban kings. The sequence is not chronological; two unqualified names are surrounded by two others which have attributes. The most important, Silvius Aeneas, is placed at the end since his name, character, and fate[1] make him an image of his forbear.[2] Two lines (771-772) in the form of an exclamation stress the power and good leadership of these heroes while the last four lines (773-776) dwell on their roles as founders[3] of cities.

All of this immediately preludes Romulus. In a structure analogous to the preceding paragraph, we first hear of his name and origin (778-779), then of his importance (779-780), and finally of his role as the founder of Rome (781-787). Thus, the reader feels that Romulus alone outweighs all of the preceding groups of kings, not unlike Rome, which by one wall embraces seven citadels (783). What is more, the authority of this city is enhanced by a simile comparing Rome to the very mother of the gods.

The first part of the catalogue seems to be finished.[4] Yet the simile of the mother of the gods immediately gives occasion to the mention of the gods who sprang from Rome, the Julians (778-790). Augustus, son of Divine Julius, will found a new golden age (792-805). As Romulus had surpassed the founders of the Alban city, so Augustus is greater than Romulus. Though not a conqueror as Alexander had been, Augustus is, nevertheless, described in terms of the eulogies to the Macedonian because of the world-wide extent of his benefits to mankind. The simple simile of *Berecynthia mater*, which applied to the *urbs*, is outdone by a double simile describing the *orbis*. The scope of Augustus' beneficial action is even larger than that of mankind's greatest benefactors, Hercules and Dionysus (801-805).[5]

---

[1] He must wait for a long time before he can assume the promised reign (770).

[2] Similarly, in the catalogue in *Aeneid* VII, the main heroes are placed at the beginning and at the end, "framing the less prominent" (Heinze, *op.cit.*, 444). For the importance of the last section in tripartite structure: Quint., *Inst.* 7. 1. 10.

[3] In Livy 1. 3. 6 the foundation of colonies is exclusively ascribed to Latinus Silvius, the son of Aeneas Silvius.

[4] Belling (*op.cit.*, n. 1) has section one end here; nonetheless he admits that there is a major caesura after 807. The passage on Augustus cannot be separated from the paragraph on Romulus. The Augustus passage is not a later addition (as Belling, *op.cit.*, 24-27 had thought) since the simile of the mother of gods announces the gods which sprang from Rome.

[5] The subdivision of Belling's (*op.cit.*, 18) "Augustus section"– (3+7+3+7 lines) is superficial.

This paragraph is clearly separated from what follows by an interpretative and paraenetic passage. The first culmination ends in an exhortation to Aeneas to set foot on Italy and brave the wars to come. This passage reveals the meaning of the catalogue (and by its analogous position attests to the indispensability of lines 890-892).

Looking back at the first part of the catalogue, we find that Virgil proportionally enlarges its parts to suit the meaning: Silvius serves as a cornerstone (7 lines); the series of the Alban kings (11 lines) is matched by Romulus alone (11 lines equally subdivided); finally the *conditor urbis* is eclipsed by the *pacator orbis* (20 lines instead of 11, a double simile instead of a single simile). The order is dictated by function and importance rather than by chronology. Virgil is not interested in cataloguing facts, but in showing how they grew out of one another and how they may be related to each other typologically.

Virtute extendere uiris

The central part of the catalogue (808-853) has a new theme, struggle, which is introduced by the phrase "expand our power through valour" *uirtute extendere uiris* (806).[1] Hitherto the themes had been the origin of Rome and the promise of peace; now it will be the growth of the city and its trial by wars. Again there is no strict chronological sequence of detail. The series of Roman kings, which had started from Romulus and had been interrupted by Augustus, is continued by Numa (808-812), who, being a king of peace, is another prototype of Augustus. The contrasting theme of struggle is richly expounded with the third King Tullus (812-814). Nine characters from the period of the monarchy are matched with nine heroes of the early Republic in eighteen lines (808-825). The Tarquinii[2] serve as a smooth transition, and the use of the second person (*uis*) adds a personal touch to the catalogue (817). The founder of the Republic, Brutus, is distinguished by the same pronoun *hic* as are Romulus and Augustus (819, cf. 781 and 791). Then there follows a pair of clans without attributes (*Decios Drusosque*) and a pair of characters with meaningful attributes (Torquatus and Camillus).[3] Freedom does have its price: Brutus has to have his sons executed, and the Decii buy

---

[1] This reading is based on the old manuscripts *P* and *R*.

[2] With regard to the description of the shield (8. 646-651), Virgil at this point limits himself to a bare mention.

[3] Belling, *op.cit.*, 18 gets it right.

victory with their own deaths.[1] Among the conquerors of the Celts, Camillus is a new Romulus,[2] Torquatus is named after the trophy he took from a vanquished Gaul,[3] and Drusus took for himself the name of a Gallic leader he had overcome.[4]

This paragraph, which corresponds structurally to the Romulus passage of section one, but in deliberate contrast comprises a multitude of heroes, covers the period up to Rome's supremacy in Italy.[5] Now, in due sequence, our attention is drawn to the universal empire (as had happened in section one). Here Caesar and Pompey enter the scene (827-835). The fact that Caesar is the conqueror of Gaul[6] is a fragile bridge from the preceding paragraph; the link to what will follow is much stronger: Anchises chides Caesar and Pompey for not preserving concord[7] and thus becomes a mouthpiece for the gentle poet's aversion to civil war. Nevertheless, indirectly, this conflict is indicative of the dimensions of the Roman Empire: Caesar crossed the Alps, and Pompey came from the orient; in other words, the one had conquered the North, the other the East. Thus, Virgil makes the reader feel the vast expansion of the Roman Empire and the greatness of Rome's power. The following paragraph, which should not be separated from the present lines,[8] will show how these powers of expansion were employed for worthier goals than that of self-destruction.

The Trojan Anchises' revenge on the Greeks must be one of the foremost goals (836-840) since the subjugation of Greece is under-

---

[1] Decius Mus (I), consul 340, struggled against the Latins; Decius Mus (II), consul 295, against the Etruscans; the grandson (III), consul 279, against Pyrrhus. Only the *devotio* of number II has any claim to be historical.

[2] Livy 5. 49. 7 and 7. 1. 10. Belling, *op.cit.*,19, not unattractively, finds a correspondence to Romulus who concluded the "first half" of section one.

[3] He also fought against the Aequi, the Volsci, and the Etruscans.

[4] Suet. *Tib.* 3. 5.

[5] Heinze's term "stadtrömische Zeit" (*op.cit.*, 443) is vague.

[6] "An Romulus anschliessend der *alter Romulus* Augustus, an die Gallierbesieger Torquatus und Camillus Galliens Eroberer Caesar mit seinem Gegner Pompeius", Heinze, *op.cit.*, 443. Heinze's analysis of this passage (*ibid.*) is a step back compared to Belling, who (*op.cit.*, 18) correctly sees that the lines 808-853 form a unit.

[7] The famous Drusi—the tribune of 91 B.C. and his father—had fought for *concordia*; their indentification with the Drusi mentioned in line 824 is not advocated by chronology. On the general character of plurals of names, see below.

[8] According to Heinze who has section 2 end in line 835 (*op.cit.*, 443), sections one, two, and three, are closed by contemporary figures. Caesar and Pompey, however, are, strictly speaking, not contemporary with Marcellus, and civil war is not an appropriate ending for a main section; it serves as a foil for what follows immediately. The caesura after line 854 has been marked by the poet himself.

stood as a reversal of the Trojan War. Along with Mummius, the destroyer of Corinth, Virgil mentions a hero who will destroy Argos and Agamemnon's Mycenae and overcome a descendant of Achilles. While it may not be immediately apparent that Aemilius Paullus is behind these riddles, it is nevertheless clear why Virgil chose to describe that general in terms of the Trojan War.

At line 841, a new series of heroes begins (841-846), which starts with Cato the Censor, ends with Fabius, and has the two Africani in the middle.[1] All of the crucial positions in this group are held by enemies of Carthage. Yet other names are also inserted into this framework by law of alliteration: Cossus follows Cato, as the Drusi had followed the Decii, Fabricius precedes the Fabii, and the *Gracchi genus* preludes *geminos Scipiadas.* In this paragraph, Virgil, not shunning playfulness, makes us feel that he has an embarrassment of riches. Nonetheless, we are entitled to ask for the reason underlying his choice of heroes.[2] Cossus is the figure most alien to this context. After Romulus and before Marcellus, he is the second winner of the *spolia opima,* and, since Romulus is mentioned in the first part of the catalogue and Marcellus in the third, Cossus has to appear in the central passage—to say nothing of Augustus' personal interest in the hero (Livy 4. 20. 7). Fabricius[3] and Serranus, famous examples of Roman thrift and restraint, develop the moral aspect of Cato who sets the tone for the entire paragraph. At the same time, they set the stage for the *cunctator,* who combines moderation and successful military leadership, the main themes of the paragraph. Although the Gracchi are mentioned without attributes, the Carthaginian context makes us think of the consul Sempronius who died in the Second Punic War.[4] Let us not forget, however, that when Virgil uses a name, he evokes all that identifies an entire *gens* and that he purposely mixes individuals and entire clans. From Anchises' point of view, the theme of revenge for Troy against the Greeks is quite logically followed by the theme "moral trial in the struggle with Carthage".

This second section of the catalogue leads into an exhortation, as did the first. Let us dwell on just one detail (853) of these famous

---

[1] Hence, not the brother who fell during the Second Punic War.

[2] More pessimistic is Norden, *op.cit.,* 315, "Schwieriger ist das positive Anordnungsprinzip der republikanischen Helden zu bestimmen ... wahrscheinlich hat der Dichter sich hier völlige Freiheit genommen."

[3] The mention of Fabricius alludes to the war against Pyrrhus.

[4] We follow Heyne *ad.loc.* Belling (*op.cit.,* 22), however, thinks of the famous Gracchi as orators, cf. Horace, *Epist.* 2. 2. 89.

lines: why does *debellare superbos* follow *parcere subiectis*, an order defying chronology? It is to give the main theme of the section, struggle, the important final position. Another remark concerns the phrase *orabunt causas melius*: how could Virgil disavow Cicero in such a way? Actually, Virgil did not think of Cicero at this moment but, yet again, of Homer. And, where does the Greek epic poet greatly praise a brilliant orator? In the substantial encomium of Ulysses' rhetorical skill within the central section of the teichoscopy (*Il.* 3. 199-224). However, Virgil, in the middle of his "gallery of heroes", distances himself from such unrestrained admiration for oratory, and opposes it, instead, to the silent *patientia* of Fabius. The tripartite structure of Virgil's catalogue has been compared to Pindar, and, perhaps, not without reason. Surprisingly, however, the relationship to the teichoscopy has been overlooked.

Looking back on section two, we note fullness as a main stylistic feature. Sections one and three contain far fewer names. The central section is linked with the preceding by Romulus, who has been separated from the rest of the Roman kings and transposed into section one. Similarly, of the list of the conquerors of Carthage, Marcellus is held back until section three.

Line 854 marks a caesura between sections two and three. It contains a reference to the listeners' reaction (*mirantibus*), which is (even metrically) reminiscent of ἠγάσσατο in the Homeric teichoscopy (*Il.* 3. 181).[1]

Two Marcelli

Unlike the second, the third section[2] of Virgil's catalogue comprises only two heroes. It is opened by Marcellus (consul 222 B.C.) whose tall figure (856) recalls Ajax, who, for his part, opened the third section of the teichoscopy (*Il.* 3. 226-227). As Ajax had been ἕρκος Ἀχαιῶν (*Il.* 3. 229), so it is said of Marcellus (856): "He shall buttress

---

[1] More perspicacious than Heinze (*op.cit.*, 443), Belling noticed that there is a major break after *debellare superbos*. It is, however, clear exaggeration when Belling has the parade of heroes end after *debellare superbos*. He thinks the rest to be an independent piece (*op. cit.*, 17), though not a later addition (*op.cit.*, 96-97). Belling's preference for dichotomy prevented him from recognizing the tripartite structure of the catalogue.

[2] It starts from *aspice* (855); the first section has started with *vides* (760); cf. *aspice* introducing the Augustus passage (788).

the Roman cause when a great war shakes it ... with his cavalry"[1] *hic* (note the pronoun reserved for the greatest heroes) *rem Romanam magno turbante tumultu / sistet eques*. Above all, Marcellus is a conqueror (*uictor* 856), the third winner of *spolia opima* after Romulus (who was mentioned in section one) and Cossus (named in section two). Finally, Marcellus, conquering both Gauls and Carthaginians (858), is an epitome of the qualities of the heroes mentioned in section two. For all its brevity (855-859), or rather, because of its brevity, the Marcellus passage is impressive. It is isolated from the rest of the catalogue by the speaker's personal remarks.

Now, for the first time, Aeneas asks a question (860-866), which adds to the reader's suspense before the final paragraph: who is the young man walking at Marcellus' side? The reader discovers this fascinating figure, as it were, through the eyes of Aeneas (863-866). Not only does the hero's tall stature evoke Homer's Ajax (*Aen.* 6. 865; *Il.* 3. 227), but the interrogative form also echoes more specifically the Homeric teichoscopy (*Il.* 3. 167; 192; 226-227), as does the mention of the hero's beauty (861; cf. *Il.* 3. 169), and his considerable entourage (3. 182-190). Twice the young hero's[2] mournful fate is foreshadowed (862; 866) in lines reminiscent of Parthenopaeus in the Euripidean teichoscopy (*Phoen.* 145-149), a parallel indicative of how much Virgil was taken by the idea of writing a teichoscopy. Finally, the third section of Virgil's catalogue ends with the idea of a hero's death as does Homer's teichoscopy.[3]

Peculiar to Virgil is the breathtaking atmosphere in this paragraph, starting from the intangible gloom hovering about Marcellus' head, Anchises' tears (867), and the programmatic word *luctus* (868). At first, Anchises declines Aeneas' question; the grief for Marcellus appears as something sacred to which no reference should be made. Then follows the revelation: had Rome been allowed to keep this hero, it would have seemed too mighty to the gods (869-871). The Tiber and the Field of Mars share the grief (872-874), and the Roman earth shares the hopes attached to this boy (875-877). Marcellus, who is the last figure in the catalogue, has the same qualities as Aeneas and Aeneas Silvius, *pietas* and heroism, complemented by *fides* (878-881). Should he break the bonds of fate, the boy is destined to be the Marcellus who embodies all of the qualities of his house and eclipses

1 Translation: C.Day Lewis (Oxford 1952; paperback: New York 1953).
2 Marcus Claudius Marcellus (42-23 B.C.), nephew and son-in-law of Augustus.
3 Helen does not know that her brothers are dead.

even his great forbear (882-883). Finally Anchises scatters purple flowers[1] on his grave (883-886).

The Past Viewed as Future

It remains to ask from what point of view Virgil looks at Roman history, why a vision meant to inspire hope ends with grief, and what is Virgil's principle of arranging historical phenomena.

The first question leads to the greatest stumbling-block for critics of this scene: spirits of heroes yet to be born are depicted by Virgil in a shape corresponding to their future life, not, as is usual in apocalyptic literature,[2] to their former life. There must have been a weighty reason to induce the poet to such a bold construction, and, in fact, this question seems to point to the very core of the invention of the *Aeneid.* Virgil wished to represent Roman history not as past but as future, thus making obsolete historical epic which had dominated Roman literature. His surprising modification of the apocalyptic tradition is but a consequence of the standpoint adopted by Virgil for his view of history. Instead of immortalizing Roman history, as Livy does, Virgil revitalizes it by starting from its very source and by challenging his readers to fathom all of its potentialities.

A similar, though much shorter, catalogue in the *Georgics* had linked the Roman heroes to Italy as sons to a mother (*Georg.* 2. 167-174); that "maternal" myth is supplemented by the "paternal" perspective of *Aeneid* 6. Already in the *Fourth Eclogue* Virgil had chosen for his starting point a moment pregnant with the greatest potential, the time before birth. This point of view, which is common to the *Bucolics*, the *Georgics*, and the *Aeneid*, is shown to be specifically Virgilian by its absence in the catalogues of heroes of other poets such as Horace (*Carm.* 1. 12) and Propertius (3. 3. 7-12). In addition, the catalogue of heroes in *Aeneid* 6, with its specific character of "expectation", is linked

---

1 Cf. *Ecl.* 5. 38.

2 Norden, *op.cit.*, 46. Against Norden one might quote the ending of Plato's *Republic*; there the spirits must wear the apparel of their future lives since they have chosen their lot and have been "changed" beforehand. I.Trencsenyi-Waldapfel, "Das Bild der Zukunft in Aeneis" (sic), *StudClas* 3 (1961): 281-304, mentions the Sibylline oracles and Lycophron as possible models of Virgil's prophetic historical visions. A.Gercke, *Die Entstehung der Aeneis* (Berlin, 1913): 195, justly stresses the closeness of the heroes' catalogue of Book 6 to the sphere of dreams, cf. Norden (*op.cit.*, 47-48; 459-460). For the idea that the living are obligated to their descendents, cf. Plato's *Menexenus*, and K.Oppenheimer, *Zwei attische Epitaphien* (Berlin, 1933), (for *Aeneid* VI, 82-83).

to the teichoscopy of the *Iliad*. This orientation towards the future,[1] as well as the tripartite[2] structure of the scenes, proves that the analogies go beyond correspondences of detail: as the teichoscopy precedes the great battles of the *Iliad*, the panorama of heroes in *Aeneid* 6 prepares the hero for the Iliadic half of the *Aeneid*. But the principle of replacing short-term expectation with long-term historical prophecy was Virgil's own.

Virgil seems to concentrate his basic idea in the person of Marcellus, who is consequently the cornerstone of the entire catalogue. What is to be praised in a hero who died prematurely? Expectations rather than deeds, *non res sed spes*,[3] as in the *Fourth Eclogue*, where a boy embodies almost unlimited promise. If such great expectations are frustrated by death, this can be considered a most precious sacrifice averting the envy of the gods from Rome. Therefore Marcellus, who represents the best qualities of his people, is not an appendix to the catalogue, as has been sometimes thought, but the heart of what Virgil wished to say in it.[4] This is corroborated by the structure of the catalogue which, in three steps, leads to the culmination, Marcellus. Each of these three sections forms a gradation in itself: 1) Alban kings, Romulus, Augustus; 2) Roman kings, Republican heroes, Caesar and Pompey, conquerors of Greece and Carthage, the mission of Rome; 3) the older Marcellus (combining in himself the qualities of the preceding heroes), and finally the younger Marcellus, who would have outshone them all. Hence, we better understand why after this vision, and despite its mournful ending, Aeneas is not depressed but elated.

Typology versus Chronology

Finally, let us review the different methods and guiding principles of arrangement. A poet, unlike an historian, will not adhere too strictly

---

1 Cf. the song of the Fates in Catullus' *Peleus and Thetis* (64. 323-381), with its preview of the life of the as yet unborn Achilles. For Roman history cf. Lycophron's *Alexandra*; the analogies might be due to a common tradition.

2 Norden, *op.cit.*, 108, mentions Pindar, Demosthenes, and Horace as examples of tripartite structure, omitting Homer's teichoscopy.

3 For the rhetorical background cf. Norden, *op.cit.*, 342. The keyword *spes* (*Aen.* 6. 876).

4 Skard (quoted above, n. 1, p. 107) considers the catalogue of heroes to be the procession of the ancestors at Marcellus' funeral. But Virgil's main innovation, the prophetic persepective, is not there.

to chronology.[1] Yet there are differences even within the bounds of poetry; there is more order to be expected of a description of a work of art, the shield for example, than from prophecy, which is the context of our catalogue.[2] Foreshadowings are supposed to be obscure, and the impression of inspiration may be conveyed by a certain fullness of style combined with some lack of order. It looks as if Virgil intentionally opposed the buoyant catalogue of heroes to the sober picture on Aeneas' shield (very probably written earlier).[3]

On the other hand, a completely disorganized list of names would have been unthinkable to Virgil. But was it really the only aim of the disposition to "facilitate the perception by the reader" as Heinze[4] had thought? It is true that, apart from chronology (which only determines the sequence of the three main sections), there are aesthetic principles of arrangement such as alliteration and the exploitation of initial, central, and final positions. More important, however, are considerations of meaning and content. Anchises calls the spirits "illustrious souls, one day to come in for our Trojan name" *inlustris animas nostrumque in nomen ituras* (758).[5] In this context, a name is not an individual but a collective notion. Viewed from afar, the bearers of the Trojan name are like a swarm of bees; at close quarters, Rome is seen as composed of families and individuals. Moreover, bearers of the same name are juxtaposed despite the abyss of time between them. As Augustus' son-in-law accompanies the old Marcellus, the mention of the Drusi might include the living members of the imperial family. The Decii, through two or three generations, embodied the specific quality of self-sacrifice. The Scipiones are (with no regard to chronology) the Older and the Younger Africanus. Unity of time is replaced by unity of name and function.

In addition to names, analogous roles can determine a hero's position in the catalogue, as is seen in the placement of Augustus between Romulus and Numa. There are also correspondences at a

---

[1] *Ordinem uoluit abrumpere et poetice confundere, ut qui non historicum sed poetam ageret.* Cerda, quoted by Norden, *op.cit.*, 315.

[2] On the closeness to *diuinatio* of the catalogue of heroes and the other historical passages of the *Aeneid*, Boyancé, *op.cit.*, 112.

[3] The catalogue of heroes constantly takes into account the description of the shield, which has a more transparent structure.

[4] Heinze, *op.cit.*, 442.

[5] Norden did not explain the last part of the sentence. Conington noted "apparently a metaphor from taking physical possession of a territory or inheritance." Forbiger quotes *in nomen adsciscere, adsumere* (to adopt into a familiy). Conington mentions *nomen Latinum* only as an analogy.

longer distance: the three winners of the *spolia opima* are distributed over the three main sections with Camillus in the second section holding a position analogous to that of Romulus in the first.

Epilogue: What can be concluded from this analysis about Virgil's attitude towards history? Within the *Aeneid*, this catalogue is meant to encourage Aeneas to further heroic deeds by promising his people a great future. The impression of abundance is enhanced by a lack of strict order in some passages, a rhetorical procedure deliberately exploited by Virgil. Similarly, rhetoric is both used and obliterated in other respects: for Aeneas, the future heroes are not παραδείγματα in the strict sense of the word (though Norden calls them so, *op.cit.*, 313). Usually, rhetoric draws its examples from the past, not the future. This is a telling instance of Virgil's utterly bold and unconventional use of traditional techniques. He neither shrinks from reversing the usual perspective of history nor from swimming against the flow of the stream of rhetoric.

For the reader, Virgil tries to bring to light the driving forces behind Roman history. By juxtaposing characters and families according to their specific qualities and roles, Virgil spares his readers tedious details from actual Roman history and, instead, leads them directly to the very roots of Rome's growth and development. That is, he grasps history *in statu nascendi*, and from that creates prototypes. Hence, the catalogue of heroes serves an intellectual purpose beyond mere edification.[1]

Intertextual relationships are established through the genre of epic catalogues, especially as presented in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Not only is the deployment of the grandeur of a nation an aim Virgil shares with Homer's catalogue of the ships, but Anchises' deep emotional involvement with the persons described in the portrait gallery also recalls Helen's frame of mind in the Teichoscopy. On a more abstract level, Virgil achieves an intriguing fusion of the epic pattern of Teichoscopy with the vast historical panorama of prophetic literature. Finally, in terms of intercultural synthesis, it is true that Virgil moulds his catalogue as a piece of fiction into Greek forms, but he vindicates the truth of his bold poetic vision by bringing it in line with historical Roman figures, accomplished facts of history, and the real community of the Roman state.

---

[1] Heinze, *op.cit.*, 479; Norden, *op.cit.*, 371.

4. Inuentio II: *Turnus, a Tragic Hero?* *Virgil and Aristotle*

In the combat between Aeneas and Turnus[1] the first peripeteia is caused by the breaking of Turnus' sword (12. 728-733). This incident furthers the action, and what has been a combat becomes a hunt. Since Aeneas' spear, in fulfilment of Turnus' prayer, is held fast by the sacred olive tree, Juturna has occasion to give a new sword to her brother, whereupon Venus helps her son to draw out his spear. The first phase of the contest ends as a draw and the accident with the sword has no decisive impact on Turnus' fate.

The next stage of the struggle is introduced by a scene in the

---

[1] Pursuing some hints given by V.Pöschl (*Die Dichtkunst Virgils*, Wien, 1950; English edition: *The Art of Vergil*, Ann Arbor, 1962; 3rd ed. of the German text [modified], Berlin, 1977), M.C.J.Putnam (*The Poetry of the Aeneid*, Cambridge, Mass., 1965) described Aeneas' victory as a "tragic victory". He was contradicted, among others, by A.Wlosok ("Der Held als Ärgernis: Vergils Aeneas", *Würzburger Jahrbücher* n.s. 8 [1982]: 9-21) and H.-P.Stahl ("Aeneas, An Unheroic Hero?", *Arethusa* 14, 1 [1981]: 157-186). The discussion was furthered by K.Galinsky ("The Anger of Aeneas", *AJPh* 109 [1988]: 321-348). C.Renger proved that, in terms of Roman law, Aeneas' behaviour is unobjectionable (C.Renger, *Aeneas und Turnus. Analyse einer Feindschaft* [Frankfurt, 1985]). Among other details she correctly observed that Aeneas is ready to spare Turnus *qua* military enemy. He therefore does not infringe the rule of *parcere subiectis*. Renger's views are accepted by F.Cairns in his important and helpful book *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (New York, Melbourne, 1989): 78. Aeneas' anger is not madness but a means to prepare himself for fighting, in accordance with peripatetic views. Cairns stresses rightly that the *furiae* have not necessarily negative implications. I do not repeat here my statements (in: *Gnomon* 38 [1966]: 564-568 and in: Vergil, *Aeneis*. Übertr. von Th.von Scheffer, Nachwort, München, 1976, pp. 299 f.), though I still maintain them. I only would like to add the present argument which seems to have escaped the specialists' attention. A further argument is added in the present book at the end of our chapter V. 7. *Elocutio* II. On the Use of Tenses in the *Aeneid* (pp. 134-141) – M.Vielberg ("Zur Schuldfrage in Vergils Aeneis", *Gymnasium* 101 [1994]: 408-425 considers the ending of the *Aeneid* an attempt to whitewash Aeneas, mainly on the grounds of political ideology, whereby the public voice of the poet overrules his private and more peaceful preferences. In my view, on the contrary, Aeneas as a public person is ready to spare Turnus (*parcere subiectis*), but as a personal friend of Euander and Pallas has to fulfill a "private" duty of revenge. Excellent and still valid remarks on the obligations of hospitality in antiquity in W.W.Fowler, *Aeneas at the Site of Rome. Observations on the Eighth Book of the Aeneid* (Oxford, 1918): 90-91; Servius had justly stressed that Aeneas' *furor* and *ira* were a consequence of his *pietas*: N.Horsfall, *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995): 213. On interferences of the political message intended and the Homeric model applied: J.J.L.Smolenaers, "De dood van Pallas en Turnus in Vergilius' *Aeneis* (X en XII). De sturende invloed van het Homerische model", *Lampas* 26 (1993): 332-355, whereas V. DiBenedetto points out the relevance of Achilles (along with the obvious reminiscences of Hector) and also of Eteocles as presented by Aeschylus, especially for Turnus' awareness of his imminent death.

heavens (791-842): Juno renounces her support for Turnus, and Jupiter sends an infernal demon, a Dira, to flit in front of the hero's eyes, presaging his death; as soon as she appears, Juturna, in desperate grief, leaves her brother. Turnus is paralysed by the sight of the Dira; having been fiercely provoked by Aeneas, he counters: "Fierce man, it is not your ardent speech that frightens me, it is the gods' and Jupiter's enmity", *non me tua feruida terrent / dicta, ferox, di me terrent et Iuppiter hostis* (894 f.). With pain he realizes his error and his blindness. This insight and the apparition of the Dira produce a daze which continues until he falls down wounded by Aeneas' spear.

Aeneas is touched by Turnus' humble entreaties and is about to spare his enemy when suddenly the belt which Turnus had taken from Pallas appears before his eyes. This is a classic example of the coincidence of recollection and peripeteia (cf. Aristotle, *Poetics* 16. 1454 b 19-1455 a 4, who even mentions personal objects as reminders).[1] Here Virgil opens a new chapter; the problem of retribution for Turnus' treatment of Pallas.

It appears that the three main reversals of the last fight between Aeneas and Turnus are successively connected with an accident, the understanding of an error, and the remembrance of an act of injustice. It will be good to keep these distinctions in mind when asking what can be called tragic in the action described by Virgil.

Aristotle, in his *Nicomachean Ethics* (5. 10. 1135 b-1136 a 3) and in his *Art of Rhetoric* (1. 13. 1374 b 6), distinguishes three types of action implying three degrees of responsibility: ἀτύχημα, ἁμάρτημα, and ἀδίκημα. The first is an unforseeable accident, the second a fault or error (that is to say an action resulting from lack of insight), the third an intentional injustice. Surprisingly enough, the three reversals of the last combat of the *Aeneid* have to be described precisely in these terms. It is difficult to resist the impression that Virgil purposely illustrated these three aspects by examples arranged in a climactic pattern. Be that as it may, we have to ask which of the stages involved can be called tragic.

The first element, accident, has to be discounted. It can certainly be called unfortunate, even terrible, but, since there is no intimate link to the hero's character, not tragic. Equally, intentional injustice, the third element, has to be eliminated since according to Roman standards, rightful retribution excludes tragic pity. It remains to

[1] Aristotle, *Poetics* 16. 1454 b 24 f.; cf. also 11. 1452 a 29-b 8.

consider the fault or error mentioned by Virgil in the second place. That an action committed out of imperfect knowledge is essentially tragic has been amply shown by Aristotle himself in the thirteenth chapter of his *Poetics*.

What conclusions from this observation can be drawn for Virgil's literary intentions in Book 12 and for Turnus as a tragic hero? Consciously the poet leads his readers from a mere accident into real tragedy, but he does not stop there. He superimposes on tragedy a new dimension which is dominated by religious ideas such as the law of retribution, the priesthood of Aeneas,[1] and the Roman alliance of *pietas* and *ultio*. By this series of scenes, Virgil shows that tragedy is a concept applicable to the *Aeneid* only to some degree and is not liable to explain all of its aspects. Whether we like it or not, the poet leads us further into a world where there are no private persons any more but priests and victims. This is not a tragic ending but the end of tragedy.

Epilogue: The present short chapter contributes a new aspect to our panorama of the impact of rhetoric on epic. It shows that a theory of different degrees of responsibility developed by Aristotle in his *Rhetoric*, in the context of how to find arguments for defending an accused, must have impressed Virgil to the point of building his invention of an important chapter of the *Aeneid* on this tripartite definition. Clearly he was aware of the fact that his readers would discuss the problem of Turnus' guilt, and to convey to them his ideas on the subject, he created three crucial scenes, each of which reveals the features of one of those three types of action. This is a remarkable reversal of what Aristotle had done. The philosopher had interpreted actions by means of abstract terms; Virgil, conversely, created actions which would embody those ideas. In this case, a rule of rhetorical invention has been transformed into a source of poetic invention. With respect to intertextuality, this exceptional example reveals the creative potential inherent even in a theoretical text, so long as there is a creative reader who is able to convert a method of interpretation into a method of poetic production.

---

[1] In Book 10, Aeneas is even ready to human sacrifice: S.Farron, "Aeneas' Human Sacrifice", *AClass* (Cape Town) 28 (1985): 21-33. Aeneas follows the example of Achilles, whose behaviour had been criticized by Plato (*Republic* 3. 391 B6). According to pseudo-Plutarch, *De vita et poesi Homeri* 2. 190, Homer in his narration showed his disapproval of what Achilles did. M.Lausberg, "*Parcere subiectis.* Zur Virgilnachfolge in der *Iohannis* des Coripp, *JbAC* 32 (1989): 105-127.

5. Dispositio. *Double Inversion and the Rhetoric of Silence (Virgil,* Aeneid *6. 450-476)*

Inter quas Phoenissa recens a uulnere Dido
errabat silua in magna; quam Troius heros
ut primum iuxta stetit agnouitque per umbras
obscuram, qualem primo qui surgere mense
aut uidet aut uidisse putat per nubila lunam,
demisit lacrimas dulcique adfatus amore est:
'infelix Dido, uerus mihi nuntius ergo
uenerat exstinctam ferroque extrema secutam.
funeris heu tibi causa fui. per sidera iuro,
per superos et si qua fides tellure sub ima est,
inuitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi.
sed me iussa deum, quae nunc has ire per umbras,
per loca senta situ cogunt noctemque profundam,
imperiis egere suis; nec credere quiui
hunc tantum tibi me discessu ferre dolorem.
siste gradum teque aspectu ne subtrahe nostro.
quem fugis? extremum fato quod te adloquor hoc est.'
talibus Aeneas ardentem et torua tuentem
lenibat dictis animum lacrimasque ciebat.
illa solo fixos oculos auersa tenebat
nec magis incepto uultum sermone mouetur
quam si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes.
tandem corripuit sese atque inimica refugit
in nemus umbriferum, coniunx ubi pristinus illi
respondet curis aequatque Sychaeus amorem.
nec minus Aeneas casu concussus iniquo
prosequitur lacrimis longe et miseratur euntem.

Amongst them, with her death-wound still bleeding, through the deep wood / Was straying Phoenician Dido. Now when the Trojan leader / Found himself near her and knew that the form he glimpsed through the shadows / Was hers—as early in the month one sees, or imagines he sees, / Through a wrack of cloud the new moon rising and glimmering—/ (455) He shed some tears, and addressed her in tender, loving tones:—/ Poor, unhappy Dido, so the message was true that came to me / Saying you'd put an end to your life with the sword and were dead? / Oh god! was it death I brought you, then? I swear by the stars, / By the powers above, by whatever is sacred in the Underworld, / (460) It was not of my own will, Dido, I left your land. / Heaven's commands, which now force me to traverse the shades, / This sour and derelict region, this pit of darkness, drove me / Imperiously from your side. I did not, could not imagine / My going would ever bring such terrible agony on you. / (465) Don't move away! Oh, let me see you a little longer! / To fly from me, when this is the last word fate allows us! / Thus did Aeneas speak, trying to soften the wild-eyed, / Passionate-hearted ghost, and brought the tears to his own eyes. / She would not turn to him; she

kept her gaze on the ground, / (470) And her countenance remained as stubborn to his appeal / As if it were carved from recalcitrant flint or a crag of marble. / At last she flung away, hating him still, and vanished / Into the shadowy wood where her first husband, Sychaeus, / Understands her unhappiness and gives her an equal love. / (475) None the less did Aeneas, hard hit by her piteous fate, / Weep after her from afar, as she went, with tears of compassion.

On his journey through the netherworld Aeneas meets Dido one last time. The scene[1] starts at line 450, the precise centre of Book 6. The action develops in three phases:

Aeneas discovers Dido (450-454); he talks to her (455-468); Dido remains silent and leaves (469-476). The first and the third parts contain important epic similes. In the following lines we will try to analyze the relationship of this scene to earlier books of the *Aeneid* and try to find out if there is a pattern to these correspondences.

Change of Roles

First, let us look at the two similes. The first of them is reminiscent of Book 1. Aeneas only vaguely descries Dido as if he saw the moon rising through a veil of clouds. This starting point of the last encounter between Aeneas and Dido sends us back to their first meeting when Aeneas, like a statue of a god, suddenly appeared from a cloud of mist which had hidden him from Dido (1. 586-593). In comparison with Book 1 the roles are now reversed. The first encounter of the lovers happened in the daylight, but they had no knowledge of their fate. Now, in the darkness of the underworld, knowledge will come. The second simile relates our scene to Book 4. Despite Aeneas' entreaties, Dido remains unmoved as marble (6. 470-471). In Book 4 conversely, Dido had implored Aeneas and he had been hard as stone (4. 366) and unshattered like an oak in the storm (4. 441-449). The similes reflect the reversal of the situation and the change of roles.

What does this reversal mean? Aeneas' speech gives a clear answer: "Poor, unhappy Dido, so the message was true that came to me / saying you'd put an end to your life with a sword and were dead?"

---

[1] The present chapter is based on my article: "Die Kunst der Spiegelung in Vergils *Aeneis*", *Hermes* 93 (1965) 54-64. Text: R.A.B.Mynors (Oxford, 1969; punctuation slightly changed here). Translation: C.Day Lewis (Oxford 1952; paperback: New York, 1953).

infelix Dido! uerus mihi nuntius ergo / uenerat exstinctam, ferroque extrema secutam (6. 456-457). What he had known only by hearsay he now sees to be true and all too real; the entire scene is a painful process of learning. The real goal of the scene is not a belated excuse on the part of Aeneas nor an act of personal revenge on the part of Dido, but Aeneas' becoming aware of what he did and facing it. When leaving Dido, Aeneas did not yet realize the complete extent of his guilt ("I could not imagine / my going would ever bring such terrible agony on you" *nec credere quiui / hunc tantum tibi me discessu ferre dolorem*) (6. 463-4). Now, however, at this last encounter, he becomes aware of the bitter truth that he has caused Dido's death: "It was death I brought you" *funeris heu tibi causa fui* (6. 458). The question marks which many editors and translators put in these lines are out of place; far from questioning his guilt, he states the facts quite simply. At this moment he remembers that it was the gods who ordered him to leave Dido against his will and who now were sending him to the netherworld. Only then does he come to realize Dido's grief—he even calls it *hic dolor* (6. 464), using the demonstrative pronoun which is usually reserved for the first person. At this moment there comes a change. While he mentions his leaving, Dido herself starts to leave him and he suddenly interrupts himself asking *quem fugis?* (6. 466). In Carthage Dido tried to hold him with almost the same words: *mene fugis* (4. 314). By suffering what Dido had suffered, Aeneas comes to measure her grief. Turned from him and looking down to the earth (6. 469), her face unmoved as if it were stone (6. 470-471), she behaves as Aeneas had behaved in Book 4. Now he uses the entreating anaphora *per* which she had vainly spent on Aeneas (6. 458-459; 4. 316). As Aeneas had left her for the sake of a higher duty, she now leaves him-for her first love Sychaeus (6. 473-474). Aeneas, who had not given in to her tears, now cries himself (6. 475-476). By suffering himself as she had suffered, he has come to understand his fatal role in her life.

From the above parallels it follows that the line of action in our scene could be called a mirror-image of Book 4. The roles of the persons, their active or passive functions, are interchanged. The poet clearly adopted inversion as a literary technique; in our case this technical procedure reflects a real intellectual and emotional process and gives it adequate expression. Thus, we may speak of art rather than of technique.

Reverse Chronology

Yet there is more. In the above passage Virgil employs still another kind of inversion. All the facts from Book 4 referred to in our scene are mentioned in reverse chronological sequence. The point of departure of the scene is Dido's death (6. 450); Aeneas' speech starts with the same (6. 457). He then speaks of his departure (6. 450, cf. 4. 361) and after this, of the divine commands which urged him to leave (6. 461-463, cf. 4. 356-359). Here Dido's and Aeneas' love ought to be mentioned; Aeneas only indirectly touches this delicate subject, saying that he could not have believed that his departure would hurt Dido so deeply (6. 463-464). This passage is not, as some modern readers think, a sign of cruel insensibility, but an expression of admiration for the greatness of Dido's love.[1] At this moment grief overwhelms Dido to the point that she moves to leave Aeneas,[2] and finally, goes back to her first love Sychaeus. Thus, we return to a point before the beginning of the Dido tragedy. Hence, in this reverse recapitulation of Dido's affair with Aeneas the principle of inversion operates in the dimension of time as well. The narrative of Book 4 is reflected in and balanced by the anti-narrative of the Dido scene in Book 6.

Virgil's Inuentio *and* Dispositio

As is well known, Virgil moulded this scene on the encounter of Ulysses and Ajax in the *Odyssey* (11. 543-564). However, neither type of inversion is found in the Homeric model. While the relationship of this scene to Homer has been sufficiently elucidated,[3] the following fact does not seem to have received due attention: despite its closeness to Homer the present scene is integrated into the body of the *Aeneid* to a much higher degree than the Ajax scene is into the *Odyssey*; Dido is a leading character in the *Aeneid*, Ajax is not in the

---

[1] On this I agree with G.Funaioli, *L'oltretomba nell'Eneide di Virgilio* (Rome, 1924): 70.

[2] This movement (*Aen.* 6. 472) is anticipated in 4. 389 (cf. also Creusa in 2. 790-791); cf. L.Bocciolini Palagi, "Enea come Orfeo", *Maia* 43 (1990): 133-150.

[3] G.N.Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer* (Göttingen, 1960), vid. Ind. Locorum; for an interesting discussion of several aspects of the Dido scene see especially: J.Tatum, "Allusion and Interpretation in *Aeneid* 6. 440-476", *AJPh* 105 (1984) 434-452; on the Dido episode see R.C.Monti, *The Dido Episode and the Aeneid. Roman Social and Political values in the Epic* (Leiden, 1981), reviewed by A.Wlosok, *Gnomon* 59 (1987): 106-110.

Odyssey (nor is there any inversional relationship to other scenes or books of the *Odyssey*). As for the Dido scene, a close connection to the body of the *Aeneid*, especially to Book 4, determines its entire structure. We have tried to show how firmly Virgil anchored it into the body of his own work.

Virgil is highly original in structuring his material. As compared to Book 4, with its full narrative and numerous speeches, the present scene is extremely condensed. The number of words is reduced to the bare essentials, and their meaning is further enhanced by structural devices. Without enlarging rhetorically upon the interpretation of Aeneas' and Dido's relationship, Virgil conveys a clear message through a meaningful arrangement of signs. He succeeds in convincing his readers without verbalizing the underlying principles. Both his reticence and the sparing use of the techniques we have studied add to the persuasiveness of the present scene.

Quoting Catullus

No less intriguing is Aeneas' reticence in this scene.[1] Those who miss a declaration of love on the part of Aeneas should look at line 460. Actually the words *inuitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi* are a quotation from Catullus' translation of Callimachus' *Coma Berenices*: *inuita, o regina, tuo de uertice cessi* (Catullus 66. 39). In Catullus (and Callimachus) the point is that the lock would be happy to give up its place in the heavens to return to its beloved mistress. Could there be a stronger declaration of love? The parallel is consistent: the declaration is belated and hopeless and all the more remarkable as both the lock and Aeneas have been privileged by the gods without feeling particularly happy about it. In its succinct allusiveness, intertextuality seems to be an ideal way of conveying such a message.

The Rhetoric of Silence and the Language of Structure

Finally, Dido's silence. In the tradition of literary theory, the Ajax scene serves as an example of the eloquence of silence, of a silence

[1] From another point of view, the taciturnity of Aeneas has been studied by D.C.Feeney, "The taciturnity of Aeneas", *CQ* 33 (1983): 204-219. There we find excellent remarks on the absence of the healing power of dialogue in many parts of the *Aeneid*, which often seems to imply some criticism of rhetoric. In the present chapter I rather insist on some positive aspects of silence in the *Aeneid* which turn out to be beneficial even in rhetorical terms.

revealing deeper emotions than words can express (cf. Ps.-Longinus, *De Sublimitate* 9. 2). The dramatic speeches and dialogues of Book 4 are counterbalanced by this single scene in which Dido, though silent, is the winner. One is reminded of the training of orators according to which a given case was to be considered from both sides, and the pros and cons to be developed in two opposing speeches.[1] Yet Virgil has done more than this; to the rhetoric of speech, which had dominated large parts of Book 4, he opposes a rhetoric of silence, which proves, in fact, much more powerful. The *disputatio in utramque partem* is superseded by a process of learning to face facts presented in a crystal clear form. Without needing many words, Virgil conveys deep meaning through the application of double inversion.

Epilogue: From the point of view of rhetoric, Aeneas' speech is an exceptional example of artificial order in a *narratio*: reverse chronology dissociates the facts from each other and leaves open the problem of causality and guilt. The fact that even this exquisite speech turns out to be fruitless, allows the reader to measure the depth of Dido's hatred. Furthermore, in structuring the scene as a whole, the poet himself applies the rhetorical principle of placing the most effective element at the end where Dido's silence and her flight are not mitigated by any prosaic, disillusioning comment in the style of the *Odyssey:* "But he [she] could have addressed me, despite his [her] anger, or I could have addressed him [her]; however, I wanted to see other souls" (λ 565-567). To make such corrections, Virgil may have been encouraged by commentaries on Homer or even by textbooks of rhetoric.

As for intertextual references in the narrowest sense of the word, the present scene is constructed as a double inversion of Book 4, namely, a condensed recapitulation of the main events in reverse order combined with an exchange of roles and significant correspondences of imagery. It is interesting that this internal textual relationship (which is entirely Virgil's) has attracted much less attention from scholars than the relationship to Homer. Yet it is only in light of the first-mentioned type that the second can be fruitfully discussed. Virgil transferred the scene from a secondary figure to a main character of his epic and appropriated the pathos of silence,

---

[1] *In utramque partem disputare*, cf. M.von Albrecht, *A History of Roman Literature* (Leiden, 1997), vol. 1: 518.

but he cut out Ulysses' final comment which destroyed the emotional impact of the scene.

An additional intertextual element is the quotation from Callimachus/Catullus, which reveals behind Aeneas' words a second level of meaning, the indirect declaration of a love he was not allowed to verbalize overtly. Here we face an intriguing intersection of "epic" and "elegiac" categories.

On an intercultural level the impossibility of a dialogue between Aeneas and Dido conveys to the reader the idea that reconciliation between Rome and Carthage is impossible. In this respect, the scene points not only to the past but to the future and thus marks a turning point in the middle of Book 6.

6. Elocutio I: *Virgil's Similes and the Genesis of the* Aeneid

Research on Virgilian similes[1] has been especially stimulated by the studies of Viktor Pöschl[2] and Magdalena von Duhn.[3] More recent scholarship has drawn our attention to recurring images.[4] Less heed, however, has been paid to the function of each simile within the context of its book and to its Greek parallels.[5] It is our intention to dwell on these aspects and relate them to the structure of the *Aeneid* as a whole[6] and to the problem of its genesis, a field which has received less attention in recent years.[7]

---

[1] The present chapter is dedicated to Walther Kraus. It is based on my article: "Die Gleichnisse und die Entstehung der *Aeneis*", *GB* 2 (1974): 1-6.

[2] *Die Dichtkunst Virgils* (Wien, 1950, 3rd ed. Berlin, 1977 [modified]). English ed.: *The Art of Vergil* (Ann Arbor, 1962).

[3] *Die Gleichnisse in den ersten sechs Büchern von Virgils Aeneis* (diss. Hamburg, 1952), see also M.von Duhn, "Die Gleichnisse in den Allectoszenen des 7. Buches von Virgils Aeneis", *Gymnasium* 64 (1957): 59-83.

[4] M.C.J.Putnam, *The Poetry of the Aeneid* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965); a more recent study which is a reliable guide to the Virgilian similes is R.A.Hornsby, *Patterns of Action in the Aeneid* (Iowa, 1970).

[5] For Homer, see G.N.Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer* (Göttingen, 1964 = *Hypomnemata* 7).

[6] See, for instance, our chapter V. 5. *Dispositio.* Double Inversion, here pp. 123-129.

[7] See, however, G.D'Anna, *Il problema della composizione dell'Eneide* (Rome, 1957); T.Berres, *Die Entstehung der Aeneis* (Wiesbaden, 1982 = *Hermes Einzelschriften* 45). The latter author explicitly accepts my chronology of the similes 4. 143-149 and 1. 497-508 (107-109). For my part, I am sorry I cannot accept his view that the books of the *Aeneid* were basically written one after another in the same order as we read them. B. himself is compelled to take into consideration a complicated working process including many revisions.

Books 1 and 7

The first simile of the *Aeneid* closes the sea storm scene and, at the same time, the initial section of the poem (1. 148-156).[1] Neptune calming the storm is compared to a wise and respected statesman quieting a riotous crowd. Whereas the main action takes place in the physical sphere, the simile is drawn from the moral sphere. Contrary to expectation, these spheres have been interchanged: Would it not be more usual in heroic epic to compare human life to nature rather than vice versa? This is confirmed by Book 7, which introduces the second half of the *Aeneid* and shows the birth of war in human hearts; there the main action is situated in the human sphere, and the similes are drawn from nature. In 7. 528-530 the beginning of war is compared to the onset of a sea storm, and in 7. 586-590 Latinus is likened to a rock in the sea[2] and thus becomes a counterpart to Neptune in Book 1.

One might ask if the first thing to be presented to the reader was also the first thing to be written by the author. The unusual exchange of the narrative and comparative spheres and the fact that there are no convincing Homeric parallels to the simile from Book 1 and an abundance of parallels for Book 7 suggest that the answer is 'no'. After all, Virgil conceived his sea storm not for its own sake, not as a gratuitous purple patch, but as a symbolic introduction to his poem in which an 'Iliad' (Books 7-12 of the *Aeneid*) was preceded by an 'Odyssey'. Consequently, to the 'Homeric' similes of Book 7 he opposed a complementary, though 'un-Homeric', simile in the first Book, to hint at the political themes and events to which the sea storm would turn out to be a prelude. And, in order to achieve this, Virgil had to invent a new kind of simile. It is difficult to imagine that the sophisticated invention and disposition of the first half of the *Aeneid* was worked out before the second half, which is relatively close to Homer. The unusual perspective of the first simile, which implies a reversal of what is familiar to us from Homer, is an indication that Book 1 represents a later stage of reflection and elaboration than

---

1 On this much-discussed simile see now D.C.Feeney, *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford, 1991): 137 "a profound inversion of the *Iliad*'s first paradigmatic similes"... "The simile establishes one of the *Aeneid*'s cardinal areas of ambition"; see esp. V.Pöschl (quoted above n. 2, p. 129): chapter 1.

2 In Book 7 all similes are related to the storm or to strong motion: 378-384 a top spinning; 463-466 seething water; 674-677 the centaurs (cf. the winds); 718-721 floods and ears of wheat.

Book 7. This order of composition, apart from being recommended by common sense, had been explicitly taught by Cicero, according to whom what has to be told first has to be written last, especially since a good introduction must be born from the very core of the subject matter.

Books 1 and 4

Books 1 and 4 are united by the place of action, Carthage; they serve as a frame to Aeneas' narrative, which fills Books 2 and 3. Moreover, Book 1 prepares Dido's love which will be the main theme of Book 4. Let us now consider the relationship between the similes in Books 1 and 4. In Book 1 Aeneas takes a bird's-eye view of the Carthaginians who are building their city with the industriousness of bees (1. 430-436), a sight which causes Aeneas to long for his own future city (1. 437). This passage is matched by the ant simile in Book 4 where Dido sees the Trojans eagerly preparing their ships for the departure (4. 402-407). Thus, Aeneas' arrival and his departure are marked by analogous imagery seen from contrary perspectives.[1] From epic tradition, the bee simile, which had been used by Homer in an important passage (*Iliad* 2. 87-93), was more familiar to ancient readers; the ant simile, which is known from Apollonius Rhodius 4. 1452-1453,[2] is less traditional. Could it be that Virgil wrote the simile in Book 4 as a Hellenistic variation on the Homeric simile he had used in Book 1? Before we draw conclusions, let us first consider more examples.

The following two similes in Book 1 compare Dido to Diana (1. 498-504) and Aeneas to a statue (1. 592-593). Both images are drawn from one and the same scene of the *Odyssey*, the encounter between Ulysses and Nausicaa (*Od.* 6. 102-109; 232-235).[3] In Book 4 there are similes related to Aeneas and Dido, but without exact correspondence in Homer; for example, Book 4 shows Aeneas as a likeness of Apollo, Diana's twin brother, in a simile which, starting from a hint in Apollonius (1. 307-310), has been shaped by Virgil after the

---

[1] In addition, contrasting emotions are suggested by the similes; the atmospheres of summer and winter reflect the happy beginning and the tragic ending of the episode, cf. von Duhn, 42 and 12-14.

[2] Tellingly, it is immediately followed by a bee simile.

[3] The simile, 1. 592-593, is thought to be un-Homeric by K.Quinn, *Virgil's Aeneid* (London, 1968): 434.

pattern of the Diana simile of Book 1. The later date of Book 4, which we suggested above, is corroborated by this example.

The first simile of Book 4 confirms Virgil's intention to create images complementary to those of Book 1. Now, the "huntress" Dido has become a wounded hind and, as we could have expected, there is less closeness to Homer in this simile than in the Diana simile of Book 1.[1] It follows that Virgil framed similes related to Aeneas and to Dido by similes related to Romans and to Carthaginians. The invention of the similes in Book 4 is more complex than in Book 1 and is based on the latter.[2]

Books 4 and 12

If our conclusions concerning the priority of the second half of the *Aeneid* to Book 1 and of Book 1 to Book 4 are right, we ought to be able to make a test by comparing a simile from Book 4 to a simile from the second part of the *Aeneid.* Turnus and Dido, the most important characters after Aeneas, are both compared to animals wounded by a hunter. The lion simile, referring to Turnus (12. 4-9), is directly comparable to *Iliad* 5. 136-143; the deer simile, referring to Dido, is more distant from Homer and more complex in meaning than the lion simile. This result, which could have been predicted on the basis of our earlier arguments, furnishes independent proof of them.

Books 1, 4, and 6[3]

We noticed that Homeric motifs used by Virgil in Book 1 are modified and varied in Book 4. The same is true of Book 6 as compared to Books 1 and 4. In another chapter we showed that, in the Dido scene of Book 6, two similes from Book 1 are transformed.

It follows that Virgil, when starting to write a Roman epic, was not satisfied with simply putting together a Roman Iliad and a Roman Odyssey, but wanted to create a meaningful interrelation between them by placing his Odyssey before his Iliad and by purposely

---

1 *Iliad* 11. 474-483. Another Dido simile, *Aeneid* 4. 301-303, is not Homeric.

2 I cannot agree with D'Anna, *op. cit.*, 118, who deems Book 4 earlier than Book 1.

3 In this paragraph I am talking of the main part of Book 1 (without the introduction, 1-156).

changing the spheres of the narrative and of the simile to show both their differences and their relationships. True, he followed Homer where similar situations (e.g. war) or characters (e.g. Aeneas–Ulysses; Dido–Nausicaa) allowed it; but, once taken up, the motifs within the body of the *Aeneid* underwent ever new metamorphoses and sublimations which cannot be exhausted by an index of Homeric parallels and which reveal to us the boldness of Virgil's planning and his sense of meaningful symmetries and inversions.

It seems possible to renew an analytic approach to the *Aeneid* which has, for some reason, fallen out of fashion, by adopting a new point of view, that is, by paying more attention to artistic considerations than they have hitherto received. As a matter of course, the poet could have made later modifications and additions[1] so that the date of single passages need not always apply to entire books. Reliable results can be obtained only where independent lines of research using different criteria converge.[2]

Epilogue: Rhetoric is not an appropriate tool for a literary analysis of Virgil's similes, although a study of similes used in speeches within the *Aeneid* might be promising. It is also true that the first simile of the *Aeneid* puts a successful orator before our eyes; but this is no proof of a "rhetorical" character in the given simile. In the domain of intertextuality (in the narrower sense of the word) the present chapter allows us to distinguish different layers: Virgil clearly attributes primary importance to the "homerizing" layer and assigns a secondary role to the Hellenistic component (Apollonius). Finally, on the level of intercultural relations, the above-mentioned simile becomes crucial; for it is in terms of Roman political life that Virgil's sea storm is viewed. Thus, the very first simile of the *Aeneid* shows us how to read this epic: behind the mythological narrative there is the solid reality of Roman society and history. This is, as it were, the "gold standard" which guarantees the validity of Virgil's poetic fiction.

---

[1] Following Paratore, D'Anna tends to assign a relatively early date to Book 6; hence, they have to consider the central Dido scene a later addition (D'Anna, *loc.cit.*, 32). This is utterly unconvincing since the Dido scene is part of a group of three scenes essential to the plan of the entire Book (Palinurus, Dido, and Deiphobus recapitulate Book 5, 4, and 2 in reverse order); moreover, the 11th Book of the *Odyssey* had exhibited a similar triad of scenes.

[2] The late date of Book 6 is guaranteed by the convergency of the variation of similes compared to Book 1; the inversion of roles as compared to Book 4; the reverse recapitulation of Books 4, 5, and 2; cf. above, n. 7, p. 129 and n. 1, p. 133.

7. Elocutio II: *On the Use of Tenses in the* Aeneid

How does Virgil use narrative tenses, and what functions do they have in their specific contexts? Let us first consider an entire book (Book 4), then analyze a shorter text from Book 12.[1]

In a narrative text one should expect that the number of historic perfects is roughly similar to the number of lines, yet there are only forty-nine historic perfects in 705 lines.[2] Percentage is equally low in the other books of the *Aeneid.* Moreover the historic perfects tend to appear in clusters, which reduces the number of tense changes and thereby makes these perfects seem even rarer. This scarcity of historic perfects has passed almost unnoticed by scholars,[3] even though it its a typical feature of Latin epic, a fact which should have some consequences for our understanding of the *Aeneid.* If the historic present is the rule in Virgil, it is not the present that needs explanation (as Koller[4] had thought), but the rarer phenomenon, the historic perfect.

---

[1] The present chapter is dedicated to Walther Kraus. It is based on my article "Zu Vergils Erzähltechnik. Beobachtungen zum Tempusgebrauch in der *Aeneis*", *Glotta* 48 (1970): 219-229. I have collected the material from the entire *Aeneid* and have chosen the above texts for the sake of brevity. To begin with, the following studies should be mentioned: G.Herbig, "Aktionsart und Zeitstufe", *IF* 6 (1896) 157-269 (with a discussion of the ancient theories); J.Vising, *Die realen Tempora der Vergangenheit im Französischen und den übrigen romanischen Sprachen. II. Französisch–Allgemeines* (Heilbronn, 1889 = *Französische Studien* 7. 2): esp. 112; E.Lerch, "Imperfektum als Ausdruck der lebhaften Vorstellung", *ZRPh* 42 (1922) 311-337; 385-425. Special heed to narrative tenses is given by R.Krautter, *Grenzen der Übersetzbarkeit, dargestellt an Werken Saint-Exupérys und ihren deutschen und englischen Übersetzungen* (diss. Tübingen, 1958). W.Pollack, *Studien zum "Verbalaspekt" im Französischen* (Vienna, 1960 = *SAWW* 233. 5). For Latin: H.Koller, "Praesens historicum und erzählendes Imperfekt", *MH* 8 (1951): 63-105; H.Weinrich, *Tempus* (Stuttgart, 1960); W.Klug, *Erzählstrukur als Kunstform. Studien zur künstlerischen Funktion der Erzähltempora im Lateinischen und im Griechischen* (Heidelberg, 1992), with a full bibliography.

[2] I exclude the perfects which are not historic but state a fact (as happens in direct speech).

[3] Two brilliant exceptions: G.Pasquali, *Vecchie e nuove pagine stravaganti* (Florence, 1952): 296 (on Ennius' preference for the present tense); on Virgil see R.Kühner, C.Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Satzlehre. Erster Teil*, 3rd ed., rev. by A.Thierfelder (Hannover, 1955): 116. Unsatisfactory, however, is J.B.Hofmann, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, rev. by A.Szantyr (Munich, 1965 = Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2, 2, 2): 307.

[4] S. note 1.

Narrative Tenses in Book 4

Where are historic perfects found in Book 4? In line 30 the perfect marks the end of a paragraph:[1] Virgil turns from Dido to Anna. In the last line of the book there are two perfects to mark the final point, Dido's death. At the beginning of new paragraphs the perfect frequently occurs in temporal clauses (4. 90; 151; 299; 474; 649).[2] The hunting scene is opened by a perfect in the main clause (4. 153).

Perfects are also found at dramatic culminations, such as before Dido's last speech (4. 649-660) and her death (4. 690-694, and 705). Moreover, the perfect is used in scenes involving gods; consider the dialogue of Juno and Venus (4. 90-128, especially 105; 107; 114), Iarbas' prayer heard by Jupiter (4. 220), Mercury disappearing miraculously (4. 277-278), the same god reappearing and vanishing in Aeneas' dream (4. 557 and 570). Likewise in Juno's and Iris' intervention after Dido's death (4. 694; 702) historic perfects give due prominence to divine action.

The same tense helps to pinpoint psychological processes:[3] it conveys the fatal impact of Anna's speech on Dido (4. 54-55 *flammauit... dedit... soluit*). Successively it draws our attention to the granting of the prayer (4. 220), the impression made by Mercury on Aeneas (4. 279), Aeneas' decision (4. 287), Dido's forebodings (4. 297), the omens seen and the ghostly voice heard by Dido (4. 453-461), and to Anna, finally becoming aware of the catastrophe (4. 672).

It appears that the perfects give us an outline of the divine actions and of the crucial psychological turning-points of the book. This is indicative of the importance attributed by Virgil to these aspects of the action.[4]

In detail, the use of tenses helps to distinguish the visual and audial spheres. Dido's dreams, for example, are introduced in the present (*uidetur*) while the unearthly voice of Sychaeus in the perfect (*uisa*).[5]

---

[1] Perfects also occur in penultimate positions within a section: this is true of the description of Aeneas' departure: in 4. 579 a perfect is followed by present forms (which develop the details); similarly in 4. 582-583 a perfect (stating the departure) is followed by a present form (depicting the ship on the sea as a final vignette). A perfect is found in *initial* position in the hunting scene (4. 153).4. 579 *dixit*; 582 *deseruere.*

[2] The beginning of Book 3 with *postquam* comes to mind.

[3] For a similar use of the perfect in Plautus: R.Heinze, "Zum Gebrauch des Praesens Historicum im Altlatein", in: *Streitberg-Festgabe* (Leipzig, 1924): 121-133, esp. 129.

[4] To designate external actions, Homer uses the aorist much more frequently than Virgil uses the historic perfect.

[5] Cf. also *audiit* 4. 672.

A frequent switching of tenses, which is common in Homer, is used sparingly by Virgil; note, however, descriptions of battles and storms where it reflects the chaotic situation (1. 82; 83; 90 the sea storm; 12. 533-553 a confused battle; 4. 160-168 tempest and changes of perspective).

Narrative Tenses in an Individual Scene

To understand better the artistic use of tenses, let us now consider a shorter passage from Book 12 (238-269). Turnus' sister Juturna has entreated the Rutulians to break the treaty with the Trojans. The psychological impact of her words on the audience is stated in the historic perfect, *incensa est* (level 1). The murmur, which is an audible consequence of this emotion is referred to in the present, *serpit* (level 2). Then, with the perfect *mutati* Virgil returns to level 1 to indicate their the change of mind. This change is then developed by contrasting past with present, background with foreground, imperfect with present (levels 3 and 2).

Even more artful is the structure of the omen by which the deception of the Rutulians is completed. It is introduced in the present (level 2): "Here Juturna throws in a heavier weight, a delusive portent, giving a sign from the signs above"[1] *his aliud maius Iuturna adiungit et alto / dat signum caelo.* The poet's comment follows: "which worked on the minds of the Italians more than anything else and miraculously deceived them" *quo non praesentius ullum / turbauit mentes Italas monstroque fefellit.* Again, the psychological aspect is referred to in the perfect (level 1).

The narrative itself starts with *namque* which announces a further development, or a story within the story. Having given the background information in the imperfect ("Jupiter's bird ... was chasing a pack of water-fowl" *Iouis ales ... agitabat auis*; level 3), Virgil renders the first reversal, which has no bearing on the final outcome, in the present tense enforced by *cum inuersum*: the eagle grasps the swan (level 2: the event is limited to the surface; it is not yet definitive).[2]

---

[1] Translation adapted from: *The Aeneid of Virgil. Translated by* C.Day Lewis (Oxford, 1952; Paperback ed., New York, 1953).

[2] A comparable technique is found in Caesar who often uses the imperfect to describe his own failures (the successes of his enemies) and frequently reserves the perfect for his own victories: J.Drescher, *Solebat oder solitus est?* (Progr. Augsburg, 1892/93).

With *arrexere animos* (251), we come back to the psychological aspect (level 1): the Rutulians begin to pay attention. The change of tense is in harmony with the change of subject and level. Correspondingly, the continuation of the omen appears in the present: *conuertunt: obscurant* (level 2). Only at the end of the omen does the perfect come back in order to enhance its importance (254-256 *donec ... defecit; proiecit; fūgit*).

In the following paragraph the Rutulians' reactions are described in the present; the perfect is reserved for the throwing of the fatal spear (266 *dixit et ... contorsit*) and for the strategic and psychological changes thereby produced: (269) "All the rows of spectators broke out in a frenzy of uncontrollable passion" *turbati cunei calefactaque corda tumultu.*[1]

Free Choice of Narrative Tenses?

Before we draw conclusions from these observations, let us examine to what degree Virgil was free in his choice of tenses.

1. What of the exigencies of metre? In our texts almost all of the perfects could have been easily replaced by presents: (238) *talibus incendit iuuenes...* (240) *ipsi Laurentes mutantur...*; (266) *dicit et aduersos telum contorquet...* (269) *turbantur cunei, calefiunt corda tumultu.* Hence, these perfects cannot have been chosen *metri gratia.*[2]

2. To what degree is the poet constrained by the verbal aspect inherent in certain tenses? In Herodotus, for instance, no durative verb admits an historic present.[3] In other words, can all verbs be used in the historic present even if their present has an 'imperfective' aspect? Can *uidet* ("he sees") be used as historic present? Statistics show that Virgil, in narrative contexts, uses *uidet* even more frequently than *uidit*, which is rather rare in main clauses.[4] Though there is a slight difference of nuance, the poet is free to choose between present and perfect according to his poetic intentions.[5] No mechanical rules can be deduced from verbal aspect in Virgil.[6]

---

[1] Later on, perfects are found at the sacrilegious beginning of the fight (283) and when Aeneas is wounded (319)

[2] For a similar conclusion for Plautus, see R.Heinze (quoted above, n. 3, p. 135): 129.

[3] Koller (quoted above, n. 1).

[4] As is to be expected, it occurs frequently in secondary clauses after *ut, ubi, postquam.*

[5] The same is true of *stupet–obstipuit; miratur–miratus (est); agnoscit–agnouit.* With *sentire*, however, there is a strong preference for the perfect.

[6] In *Aen.* 4. 200 between two historic presents (197; 204) a retrospective

3. The category of chronological precedence does have some importance; it explains much of the interrelation between pluperfect and perfect. It is often used at the beginning of paragraphs to sketch the background,[1] and there are also instances where the antecedents are related as a postscript in the pluperfect introduced with *namque*. In the *Aeneid* the problem becomes more complicated by the fact that chronological priority as related to a historical present can be expressed in a twofold way, by the pluperfect or by the perfect.[2]

4. Simultaneousness is expressed by the imperfect. Two parallel imperfects can help to make a transition from one scene to another (4. 553-555): *illa ... rumpebat: Aeneas ... carpebat.* It also serves to take up the main action after a speech, a simile, or an episode. In relation to the historic perfect and the historic present, the imperfect gives a background which is on the same chronological level.[3] Yet two parallel actions can also be related in two present tenses. This shows the limits of a purely chronological approach to the use of tenses in the *Aeneid.*

5. Given the high degree of freedom in the use of tenses, an approach which starts from the context seems the only reasonable one. A continuous observation of narrative structures leads to the discovery of recurring patterns and to an appreciation of the artistic use of tenses.

Conclusion

In our texts the poet distinguishes between different levels of action through his use of tenses, and this brings his story into full relief. Psychological processes and the main stages of the action are given in the perfect, elaboration of detail in the present tense, and background information in the imperfect or pluperfect. It is up to the poet to assign the historic perfect or the historic present to certain levels of the action, and to save one of the tenses for crucial points of the narrative. It is up to the reader to observe the author's artistic economy in the use of tenses and their interplay with particles (such as *tum uero* introducing a culmination, or *namque* announcing a

---

explanation is inserted (here we find perfect and pluperfect forms).

[1] H.Weinrich (quoted above, n. 1, p. 134) calls the imperfect and the pluperfect "background tenses".

[2] Early Latin usage is partly different, see Koller (quoted above, n. 1, p. 134).

[3] In *Aeneid* 4. 641 a secondary action is referred to in the imperfect.

specific development). Another field of investigation is the use of tenses combined with the effective use of syntactical devices such as *cum inuersum* or *donec*, constructions which, paradoxically, emphasize the main action by placing it in a secondary clause.

What do these considerations contribute to our understanding of Latin tenses? The Latin perfect can neither be explained completely in terms of time nor in terms of aspect.[1] Yet, perhaps, it would be equally wrong to neglect these explanations entirely, for the Latin perfect is not only a narrative tense, nor only what we would call a "present perfect". Thanks to the combination of both of these functions, facts of the past stated in the Latin perfect acquire a gravity peculiar to no other tense. Virgil exploits this characteristic of the Latin perfect to emphasize what is important to him.

Given the wide margin for a poetic use of tenses, a method isolating only the first historic present in a text (which is Koller's[2] method) will not do for Virgil. In a linguistic analysis of poetry we have to take into account the poet's intention and design. Moreover, Koller's method does not apply to the study of Roman epic since, in this genre, the present is the rule and the perfect the rarer phenomenon. Weinrich's distinction of 'foreground' and 'background' tenses helps to clarify the function of historic present and perfect, on the one hand, and imperfect and pluperfect, on the other. Nevertheless, Weinrich has not succeeded in completely discarding the aspect theory.[3] What is more, his description of the historic present as a "tense metaphor", apart from the fact that the term "metaphor" is inappropriate, does not account for the fact that in Virgil the historic present is the rule. Koller correctly observed that in Latin epic historic present assumes the function of Homer's narrative imperfect.[4] As for the relationship of present and perfect in Virgil's text, we notice that the former is frequently related to the surface, the latter to the depth of the story. In Virgil, the use of tenses turns out to be much more than a linguistic problem; it is part of a narrative syntax of epic, a subject on the crossroads of morphology, syntax, textual syntax

---

[1] In terms of history of language, the Latin perfect is complex. There are both reduplicated forms (which correspond to the Greek perfect) and sigmatic forms which are comparable to the Greek aorist.

[2] Koller (quoted above, n. 1, p. 134).

[3] One should not deny the aspect character of a given tense but analyze the function which the poet confers on it within his narrative.

[4] To express an "inceptive and durative" aspect, Homer uses the imperfect, whereas Herodotus prefers the present: Koller (quoted above, n. 1, p. 134).

(transcending the single sentence), philological interpretation of texts and rhetorical and poetic theory. Even a topic like Virgil's relationship to Homer, which has been discussed for 2000 years, might profit from a fresh approach. An intertextual study of the use of tenses in Homeric and parallel Virgilian scenes would break new ground in classical scholarship. Apart from linguistic differences between Greek and Latin, it would reveal another dimension of Virgil's independence and creativity. Ultimately, it might become possible to bring the linguistic reality of the text in line with the results of Heinze's[1] illuminating study of epic technique, Mehmel's[2] observations concerning time in epic, or Zielinski's[3] analysis of the treatment of simultaneous events in epic. To give an example, the imperfect is not only a "background tense"; it also allows to leave a completed action which has come to rest and to switch over to another action which begins with a state of rest.[4] It was our aim to draw the attention of specialists in all these fields to a subject which certainly would greatly reward their common efforts.

Finally, a study of Virgil's tenses makes us aware of structural hints given by the poet; consider the perfects marking the beginning or the end of a paragraph or the imperfects and pluperfects setting the frame for a new scene. What is more, Virgil's use of the perfect reveals what is important to him. We have seen that this is generally true of divine action and psychology. Virgil's use of tenses can even contribute to our understanding of one of the most controversial scenes of the *Aeneid.* Does Virgil stress, in the finale of his work, the very fact that Aeneas kills Turnus (this would confirm Putnam's[5] view that Virgil insisted on Aeneas' and even Jupiter's injustice)? Or does the poet stress the ethical motivation of Aeneas' behaviour? The use of tenses in the paragraph shows what is important to Virgil: the perfect is reserved for the appearance of the belt, which, as a *monumentum,* gives the moral and psychological reason for the act of vengeance whereas the act itself is described in the historic present. By the very

---

1 R.Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik* (Leipzig, 1914).

2 F.Mehmel, *Virgil und Apollonius Rhodius* (Hamburg, 1940 = *Hamburger Arbeiten* 1).

3 T.Zielinski, "Die Behandlung gleichzeitiger Ereignisse im antiken Epos I", *Philologus,* Suppl. 8 (1898-1901): 407-449. Cf. also G.Krókowski, *Quaestiones epicae* (Wrocław, 1951).

4 Cf. *Aeneid* 11. 445-446 *illi haec inter se dubiis de rebus agebant / certantes, castra Aeneas aciemque mouebat.*

5 M.C.Putnam, *The Poetry of the Aeneid* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965): ch. IV, "Tragic Victory".

use of tenses the poet conveys the idea that he considers the killing of the enemy a mere consequence of the preceding mental process, the recognition of a duty of *pietas*. Far from being a purely linguistic phenomenon, Virgil's use of tenses reveals both the poet's narrative art and the fact that he did not confine himself to telling a good story.

Epilogue: Virgil's poetic use of tenses defies a strictly "rhetorical" approach, although Weinrich observed that the historic present is an example of "metaphorical" use of a tense. On the level of "intertextuality" direct comparison with Homer is excluded, given the considerable differences between the verbal systems in Greek and Latin. However, Koller justly noticed some analogies between Homer's "narrative imperfect" and Virgil's historic present. What is intriguing about Virgil's use of tenses is the degree to which phenomena of grammar are subdued to his artistic intentions, including the strong guidance given to the reader concerning the relative importance attributed to each event.

CHAPTER SIX

OVID

1. Inuentio. *Ovid and His Readers*

Readers and Reading Habits

What does Ovid tell us of reading habits in antiquity? How did he try to influence his readers, and what might be the public's influence on the structure of his work?[1]

Acontius, having fallen in love with Cydippe, who is betrothed to another, writes the following words on an apple: I swear by the goddess to marry Acontius. The girl who picks up the apple in the temple reads the words and is, consequently, bound by oath (*Heroides* 20 and 21). The story makes sense only if Cydippe read aloud. In fact, this was the rule in antiquity. Only as late as Augustine's *Confessions* (6. 3. 3) do we hear of silent reading as a strange habit of Ambrose. His friends were at a loss: did he wish to save time? Or his voice? Or, did he wish to avoid having to answer difficult questions from his audience?[2] Because classical literature is intended for the ear rather than for the eye, its specific qualities are felt only when it is read aloud to an audience. A listener immediately participates in a process of persuasion; hence the great importance of rhetoric to Roman literature. To a Roman, rhetoric and poetry are not in opposition; it will be one of our tasks, however, to draw a borderline between the rhetoric of oratory and the rhetoric of poetry. This distinction will be one of degree rather than of principle.

From habits of reading, let us now pass to groups of readers. In one of his elegies (*Am.* 2. 1. 5-10), Ovid imagines a loving couple reading his poems to one another and the young man asking himself how the poet could know all about *his* feelings. In antiquity, the

---

[1] In general, consult the following fascicles of *AU*: 22. 1 (1979); 23. 6 (1980), both edited by P.L.Schmidt; cf. also E.Lämmert, *Bauformen des Erzählens* (Stuttgart, 1955); W.Iser, *Der implizite Leser. Kommunikationsformen des Romans von Bunyan bis Beckett* (Munich, 1972).

[2] If Cydippe's letter (Ov., *epist.* 21) starts from the remark that, fearing a new trap, she read Acontius' letter *sine murmure*, this is shown by the context to be the exception confirming the rule.

reader is not isolated: reading is a communicative act. As a rule, the immediate motive for reading a book is the subject matter in which the reader might be personally involved. This is even more evident in the *Art of Love* (1. 1-2): "If any of our people does not know the art of love, let him read this and, having read, be an expert in love." At the end, the readers are encouraged, after their victories, to write on the *spolia*: "Naso was my teacher". Didactic poetry, subjecting the reader to an educational process, is an extreme case of the poet's influencing his public.[1] Yet this is not an exception; even in a genre as objective as epic, Ovid verbalizes his communication with his public, but, of course, gives his readers greater freedom than would a didactic poet.

What were Ovid's readers like? Seneca the Elder draws a vivid picture of Ovid's public, lively young people, frequently visiting famous declaimers to learn from them or just to enjoy their witty and florid speeches. There were also Ovid's young fellow-poets in the Messala circle and his friend Propertius, who frequently read his poems to Ovid, as did the old Aemilius Macer. Not content with private reading, however, Ovid turned very early to a larger audience. Almost at the same period we find him shaving for the first time and reading to the people (*Trist.* 4. 10. 57). He tries, what is rare, to please equally the connoisseur and the layman, and, what is rarer still, he succeeds.

As early as the *Amores* and the *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid is confident that he will find a wide readership while, in his poetry of exile, he claims to be the most read Latin author, though still alive (*Trist.* 4. 10. 128). This kind of publicity is alien to the Callimachean tradition of which, in other respects, Ovid is a follower. While Horace had thought that his memory would live as long as Roman state religion (*Carm.* 3. 30), Ovid relies on his readership ("wherever Rome's power extends over the conquered world, I will be read by the people", *Met.* 15. 877-878). And it is, again, to his readers that he appeals against the Emperor who banished him (*Trist.* 3. 7. 47-52).[2] Finally, in the quoted passages,

---

[1] U.Kettemann, *Interpretationen zu Satz und Vers in Ovids erotischem Lehrgedicht. Intention und Rezeption von Form und Inhalt* (Frankfurt, 1979): *passim.*

[2] See my interpretation of *Trist.* 3. 7 in: *Römische Poesie. Texte und Interpretationen.* (Heidelberg, 1977): 219-276. On *Trist.* 4. 10 (Ovid's autobiography) see G.Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie,* vol. 1, *Das Altertum* (Frankfurt, 1949): 317-320; E.Paratore, *L'elegia autobiografica di Ovidio (Tristia IV, 10),* in: *Ovidiana. Recherches sur Ovide* (Paris, 1958): 353-378; W.Kranz, "Sphragis, Ichform und Namensiegel als Eingangs- und Schlussmotiv antiker Dichtung", *RhM* 104 (1961): 3-46 and 97-124.

Ovid thinks of a future audience and, in his autobiography, he even addresses posterity (*Trist.* 4. 10. 2) and gives his thanks to the benevolent reader (*ibid.* 132).

These passages show what importance Ovid assigned to his public. Is this attitude reflected in his poetical practice? We choose as an example the most "objective" of his works, the *Metamorphoses.* If communication between author and reader proves to be essential to the *Metamorphoses,* this will be all the more true for the other works. The question of how such contacts are put into words will lead us into problems of style[1] and further into the discussion of the genre[2] of the *Metamorphoses.* Our subject, which had seemed to be historical, turns out to be literary.

An Epic Poet Contacting his Readers?

In the *Metamorphoses,* Ovid, if not addressing his reader directly, does not shrink from using the generalizing second person, which somehow includes the reader. Thus, he says of Arachne's craftsmanship "you might have known that Pallas had taught her" (6. 23) and of a cruel race sprung from giants' blood: "you might have known that they had been born of blood" (1. 162).[3] In the description of metamorphosis, the second person involves the reader almost as an eyewitness: "You would have thought they floated on wings—and they did float on wings" (*pennis pendere putares: / pendebant pennis* 6. 667-668).

Elsewhere the author anticipates an objection of his readers' who might refuse to believe an improbable feature of the myth. Being a good psychologist, Ovid sweetens the pill by inserting an excusatory parenthesis before the difficult point: "And the stones—who would believe it unless ancient tradition vouched for it?—began at once to lose their hardness" (1. 400-401). The absurd article of faith that Dionysus was sewn into his father's thigh is preceded by the parenthesis *si credere dignum est* (3. 311). In the following example, Ovid plays on the

---

[1] I analyzed this topic in 1959: *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion,* Hildesheim, 1964 (*Spudasmata* 7).

[2] R.Heinze, *Ovids elegische Erzählung* (Leipzig, 1919), contradicted by D.Little, in: E.Zinn, ed., *Ovids Ars amatoria und Remedia amoris. Untersuchungen zum Aufbau = AU* 13, suppl. 2 (1970): 64-105.

[3] M. von Albrecht, "L'episode d'Arachné dans les *Métamorphoses* d'Ovide", *REL* 57 (1979): 266-277.

topos of poets telling lies:[1] Scylla, who is a monster, has a maiden's face and—unless everything the poets have left is lies—once upon a time she had been a maiden indeed (13. 733-734). With a twinkle of the eye, Ovid establishes a sort of complicity with his reader—against all those untrustworthy poets. The communication with the reader borders on self-denial. In the immediate rhetorical context, such an aside helps to enhance the narrator's credibility; indirectly, however, by admitting that poets are known to be liars, it helps to create some distance between the story, which is part of the *theologia fabulosa*,[2] and its enlightened reader. The myths of metamorphosis enacted in the *Metamorphoses*, with an utmost degree of visual suggestivity and rhetorical credibility, will be used in the poetry of Ovid's exile as stock examples of the unbelievable (*Trist.* 4. 7. 11-18).[3] In parentheses such as these Ovid, rather paradoxically, seems to ask: dear reader, am I not good at making you believe even the most unbelievable things? By doing so he makes us aware of the difference between the rhetoric of persuasion, in which both the speaker and the listener are subject to a practical goal, and the rhetoric of poetry, which sets both of them free to enjoy the interplay between author and reader.

Quoting Earlier Poets

Here we might stop for a short digression on literary reminiscences.[4] Whoever hears the words *uirginis ora gerens* (*Met.* 13. 733-734) cannot but remember Venus appearing to Aeneas in Carthage *uirginis os habitumque gerens* (*Aen.* 1. 314). This reference to the Virgilian context and to the goddess of love gives Ovid's joke on *uirgo* its full poignancy: the poet appeals to the reader's literary knowledge and rewards him with a pleasure he otherwise would have missed. Literary reminiscences, often misunderstood as a display of erudition on the part of the poet, are rather an appeal to the reader's literary experience and part of the dialogue between the author and his audience. The

---

1 W.Stroh, "Hesiods lügende Musen", in: *Studien zum antiken Epos.* Festschrift F.Dirlmeier and V.Pöschl (Meisenheim, 1976 = *Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 72): 85-112.

2 Varro apud Aug., *ciu.* 6. 5.

3 For Ovid's treatment of traditional mythology, see now J.Fabre-Serris, *Mythe et poésie dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide. Fonctions et significations de la mythologie dans la Rome augustéenne* (Paris, 1995). For the special problem of Ovid's "credibility", cf. P.Esposito, *La narrazione inverosimile. Aspetti dell' epica Ovidiana*, Napoli 1994.

4 M.von Albrecht, *Zitat*, in: *Lexikon der Alten Welt* (Zürich and Stuttgart, 1965): col. 3339; *Imitation* 1376; *Plagiat* 2335-2336.

reader, being made an accomplice of the author, comes to regard the mythic stories from a distance.

In Romulus' apotheosis Mars reminds Jupiter of an old promise and quotes it from the venerable Ennius (*Met.* 14. 814; Ennius, *Ann.* 66-67 V.= 54-55 Sk). Ovid enjoyed improving the quote by shortening it; by omitting the last word *templa*,[1] he adds to the poetic effect of *caerula caeli.* The Elder Seneca (*Contr.* 7. 1. 27) tells us that Ovid, in a discussion with his friends, reduced a line of Varro Atacinus to its first three words and thus bestowed an unexpected grandeur upon it: *omnia noctis erant* ("night possessed everything"). As in the previous example, by the omission of a noun (*quiete*) a former attribute becomes independent and thereby takes on greater prominence and suggestivity. It is not by chance that Ovid's quotations give us a glimpse into the atmosphere of the literary discussions he had with his friends.

Similarly, in the Narcissus story (*Met.* 3. 353), Ovid tries to improve a line of Catullus (62. 42). *Cupiere* which replaces *optauere* eliminates an elision and a spondee and thus makes the line smoother if, perhaps, less expressive. There is more. In the following verse the line is repeated with two new changes: *nulli* instead of *multi* and *tetigere* instead of *cupiere.* The reader is not only pleased to recognize the line, he is also surprised by the witty continuation. At the same time Ovid re-evaluates sexual continence: whereas Catullus had praised the bride's chastity, Ovid sees Narcissus' lack of response as a shortcoming.

To conclude our digression, literary reminiscences and citations serve as starting points for a dialogue with the reader, inviting him to detach himself for a moment and sharpen his judgement by comparing and reflecting.

Changes of Speed

Let us now turn to the guidance given the reader by the author through the structure of his text. Ovid's narrative does not proceed at a unified speed and the amount of detail varies considerably. A typically Ovidian narrative might be introduced by a careful description of the place of action. Gradually, the perspective is narrowed down until we come to know the hero's habits and, finally, the

---

[1] A section in the sky mentally demarcated by the *augur.*

specific action of the narrative. The very change of tenses, therefore, invites the reader to distinguish different levels and stages of action.[1]

Before crucial events, the reader's suspense is enhanced by means of retardation such as monologues or epic similes which sympathetically describe a character's feelings before a decisive event. Here Ovid does not spare his words; he is intrigued with moments of suspense. After the turning point, however, the speed of the narrative changes completely and Ovid hastens towards the end so as not to detain his reader. Once the main event has been related, there is, inevitably, a rapid disappearance of suspense and interest.

Creating Distance

The following example might show how radically Ovid's narrative is focused on the reader. In order to put Argus to sleep (*Met.* 1. 689-712), Mercury tells him of Pan and Syrinx, a story which suspiciously resembles the romance of Apollo and Daphne related by Ovid shortly before. In the middle of his narrative, Mercury, seeing that Argus has dozed off, stops, and the poet in a business-like *oratio obliqua* briefly informs us about the ending. The boredom which the repetition produces in the reader is playfully projected by Ovid on to the listener of the story within the story. The interruption and the abrupt ending are elements which underline the intellectual aspects of Ovid's narrative technique. Without investigating further the technique of the story within the story,[2] let us merely mention that Ovid projects the readers' reactions into the imagined audience of the story within the story. Such passages may suggest sympathy (*factum mirabile cunctos / ceperat* 8. 611-612) or distance, which might be enhanced by two contrary evaluations of the preceding story (some listeners think that Diana was cruel to Actaeon, others that she punished him justly, *Met.* 3. 253-255).

Distance can be created as early as in the introduction to a narrative. At the beginning of the Orpheus story, Ovid uses what

---

[1] On Ovid's narrative technique, see my "Zur Funktion der Tempora in Ovids elegischer Erzählung (*Fast.* 5. 379-414)", in: M.von Albrecht and E.Zinn, eds., *Ovid* (Darmstadt, 1968 = *Wege der Forschung* 92): 451-467; Idem, "Qua arte narrandi Ovidius in Amoribus usus sit", in: *Acta Conventus omnium gentium Ovidianis studiis fovendis* (Bucharest, 1976): 57-63; also Th.Döscher, *Ovidius narrans. Studien zur Erzählkunst Ovids in den Metamorphosen,* (diss. Heidelberg, 1970, publ. 1971).

[2] See K.Gieseking, *Die Rahmenerzählung in Ovids Metamorphosen* (diss. Tübingen, 1965).

might be called a technique of "headlines", mentioning first, contrary to chronology, what is most important: Eurydice *died* after a snake had bitten her in the heel (10. 10). This *hysteron-proteron* and the coolness of the entire introduction were often misunderstood. French translators of the Seventeenth Century, as well as the great Dutch poet Vondel,[1] not only re-established the chronological sequence,[2] but even tried to "improve" on the dry message with sentimental embellishments and developed the "short report" into a little narrative: "a hidden snake bit the beautiful lady, worthy to be loved, from behind in the heel. She dies. He sits in grief" (Vondel). These translators have reduced the animated speed of Ovid's introduction to an ordinary measure and tried to raise the readers' sympathy at a moment when Ovid had not yet intended to do so. Thus, they disfigured the structure of the narrative beyond recognition. In such cases the so-called history of reception helps us to understand the original better: Ovid had placed a sympathetic central panel between an introduction and an ending which created distance.

In such cases, Ovid has even been abandoned by some of his best critics such as Rudolf Merkel. Take, for example, the message where Ovid apostrophizes Medea: "You too, barbarian, would have liked to embrace the conqueror, but your modesty stood in the way, still you would have embraced him; but respect for common talk held you back" (7. 144-146). Since Ovid had hitherto sketched a sympathetic picture of Medea's feelings, the cool calculation found in our passage contradicts the ethos of what preceded it. For that reason Merkel believed that the lines 145-146 must go.[3] Ovid, it seems, is cooler and more realistic than many of his readers. For, as early as here he is preparing his audience for the later Medea who will be a master of deception (7. 297-308).

A similar disillusionment frequently appears towards the end of stories. At the conclusion of a sympathetic account of Pyramus' suicide, the hero is compared to a damaged water pipe (4. 122-124). In the main section of the Orpheus myth, love triumphs; in the finale, Orpheus' fidelity to his dead spouse elicits a strangely dry comment: either because it had gone badly for him or because he had given his

---

[1] M. von Albrecht, "Vondels niederländischer Ovid—ein poetisches Testament", *Lampas* 12 (1979): 154-172.

[2] As does even the Penguin translation of 1955.

[3] *P. Ovidius Naso, ex iterata* R.Merkelii *recognitione, vol. 2: Metamorphoses* (Lipsiae, 1875).

word (10. 80-81). By means of this painful awakening, the readers' attention is averted from Orpheus and turned to the stories to follow: one of the main subjects will be homosexual love, the invention of which was a by-product of Orpheus' above-mentioned oath of fidelity to his dead wife. That the bard disdained female love could not be passed over in silence since this fact would eventually lead to Orpheus' death at the hands of the Mænads. By his seemingly heartless remarks Ovid, at an axial point of his narrative, readies his readers for crucial themes. Therefore, one should not follow the editor Breitenbach who deleted the relevant lines.[1]

The way in which similes, according to their position within the story, guide the reader's attention, is discussed in a separate chapter of this book.[2]

Direct and Indirect Guidance Given to the Reader

Another important means to facilitate the readers' understanding of the story is a direct or indirect announcement of what will follow. Often it is at the very moment of transition that we come to know the new theme such as: "Infinitely great and boundless is the power of heaven" (8. 618-619); or: "Byblis serves as an example that girls should love only what they are allowed to" (9. 454). Further investigation of these announcements as to whether and how they lead or mislead the reader might be rewarding.[3] The beginning of new major sections of the *Metamorphoses* is often signalled by an important name which is to dominate the new section, as is true of Athens, named in 6. 421, and relevant as far as Book 8; similarly, Troy is mentioned in 11. 199 at the beginning of the "Trojan" section. In the introduction to Book 9, which is a passage serving as a bridge between two major sections, the central character of the section to come, Hercules, fights and conquers Achelous, who had played an important role in the preceding story. In another chapter we will come back to the role of Venus at the beginning and the ending of Ovid's "Aeneid". Such clues given to the reader help him to find his way through the maze of the *carmen perpetuum.*

---

[1] *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen* (Zürich and Stuttgart, 1964^{2}).

[2] M.von Albrecht, "Zur Funktion der Gleichnisse in Ovids *Metamorphosen*", in: *Studien zum antiken Epos* = *op. cit.* n. 1, p. 146: 280-290.

[3] W.Ludwig, *Struktur und Einheit der Metamorphosen Ovids* (Berlin, 1965), has important suggestions.

This is true even for individual narratives. At an early stage of the story an attribute may anticipate an unfortunate outcome. For example, early in the Daphne story, Apollo is said to cherish a *fruitless* love (1. 496) and, in a later context, Daedalus will give his son a kiss (8. 212) which he was destined never again to do (*non iterum repetenda*). Rarely does the poet give a personal comment as even Homer and Virgil occasionally had done.[1]

Another form of foreshadowing is tragic irony.[2] Niobe,[3] who is still at the peak of her power and happiness, hypothesizes the loss of one or other of her children and thus unwittingly prepares the reader for the catastrophe to come. The Tyrrhenian seamen, while insulting Acoetes, are much closer to the truth than they know: "All our safety depends on you" (3. 647-648). Paradoxically, tragic irony, on the one hand, prepares the reader for the future development of the story while, on the other hand, in order to be understood, it also presupposes on the part of the reader some knowledge of what is to come. This apparent contradiction, however, is easily resolved. Since the outline of a myth was usually known to the ancient reader, he could pay more heed to how the story was told than to the mere content. By using tragic irony, the poet honours the reader by treating him as his equal, and by assuming that he looks at the story from a standpoint not inferior to his own, which thus enables him to savour his intellectual advantage over the acting character. Ovid's closeness to classical drama, which has been wrongly termed a theatre of illusion by Brecht[4] (it is rather a theatre of insight), is especially evident when the reader knows that a person has disguised himself and is playing a role. Vertumnus, in the guise of an old granny, discusses with the beautiful Pomona the advantages of marriage in general, and to young Vertumnus in particular. In so doing, he cannot stop playing with his disguise: "He doesn't know himself better than I do" (14. 679-680). "Imagine that he entreats you through my mouth" (14. 691-692), and even: "Listen to me who loves you more than all the others

---

[1] Cf. R.Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik* (Darmstadt, 1965): 370-373.

[2] On *ambiguum*: M.von Albrecht, *op. cit.* n. 1, p. 145: 140-143 esp. n. 146; W.Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (London, 1949): *passim*; E.Doblhofer, "Ovidius Urbanus. Eine Studie zum Humor in Ovid's *Metamorphosen*", *Philologus* 104 (1960): 63-91 and 223-235.

[3] L.Voit, "Die Niobe des Ovid", *Gymnasium* 64 (1957) 135-149; E.Römisch, *Metamorphosen Ovids im Unterricht. Mit einem Beitrag von* H.Meusel (Heidelberg, 1976 = *Heidelberger Texte. Didaktische Reihe. Heft* 9): 21-45 (on Niobe, *Met.* 6, 146-321).

[4] Correctly, W.Görler, "Über die Illusion in der antiken Komödie", *A & A* 18 (1973): 41-57.

do, even more than you can guess" (14. 676-677). This is to make the reader the poet's accomplice and the spectator of a comedy which he enjoys doubly for knowing the truth.

Editorum et magistorum in usum

In conclusion, as far as scholarship is concerned, an inquiry into Ovid and his readers can have a bearing on textual criticism; as we have already seen, some deletions proposed by editors prove to be unnecessary. Moreover, such an inquiry modifies our conception of the *Metamorphoses* as a whole as well as of the single narrative; both turn out to be oriented towards the reader from the beginning. In addition, our subject touches on the problem of the style of the *Metamorphoses*,[1] baroque or mannerist, epic or elegiac. It is also relevant to the question of the use of quotations and, finally, to the criticism of some translations, which reflect a lack of awareness of the dialogue between author and reader as a factor which conditions the specific features of Ovidian narrative.

Finally, let us add some remarks on the practice of teaching. The question of the relationship between author and reader might encourage a class to read carefully: what information does the poet give the reader, and when does he do so? What information does he withhold, and why? Such questions can be treated especially fruitfully if the class, having finished the reading of a story, comes back to the introduction to re-read it carefully and discover in it the artful preparation of things to come: what hints are given at the beginning to prepare the ending of the story? Why is Aeneas introduced as *Cythereius heros*?

Another way to exploit the communication between author and reader is to compare the text with translations and imitations from later epochs. Divergencies, which can easily be found by students, often turn out to be very telling. The Orpheus story, for example, where the imitator is more explicit than Ovid, helped us to understand better Ovid's striving for distance in the introduction.

What kind of readers does Ovid expect to have? Are they supposed to be active or passive? Devoted or critical? Dreaming or awake? In several instances we could show that some of the difficulties

---

[1] E.Lefèvre, "Die Bedeutung des Paradoxen in der römischen Literatur der frühen Kaiserzeit", *Poetica* 3 (1970): 59-82.

experienced by modern readers of Ovid are due to the fact that the poet, often enough, invites or even compels us to take a distant view and reflect. Since he himself gives us the necessary information about the orientation of his work towards his readers, the *Metamorphoses* is especially suitable as an introduction to a reflective reading of poetic texts, a reading both demanding and rewarding.

Epilogue: Rhetorical categories are relevant to the stylistic forms in which the poet puts himself into contact with his reader and to guide him through the maze of the *Metamorphoses*. But rhetoric, which by definition follows a practical aim of persuasion, does not suffice to explain the poetic function of such devices.

Intertextuality is a more fruitful domain in this chapter. There are evidently ironical, even irreverent references to older texts (even to Virgil). On the other hand, the way Ovid has his Mars quote Jupiter's promise from Ennius (*Met.* 14. 814) shows that even for this poet Roman epic tradition forms a *continuum* and an inseparable whole (so, too, for the people of Israel are the Scriptures identical with their history). This short literal citation leads Mars to evoke the broader context of memory (*nam memini memorique animo pia uerba notaui*, Ovid, *Met.*14. 813), a dimension which is essential to the presence of both poetry and history in the reader's mind.

2. Prooemium. *Ovid's Arachne and Human Creativity* (Met. *6. 1-25)*[1]

Praebuerat dictis Tritonia talibus aures,
carminaque Aonidum iustamque probauerat iram.
tum secum 'laudare parum est, laudemur et ipsae
numina nec sperni sine poena nostra sinamus',
Maeoniaeque animum fatis intendit Arachnes,
quam sibi lanificae non cedere laudibus artis
audierat. non illa loco nec origine gentis
clara, sed arte fuit; pater huic Colophonius Idmon
Phocaico bibulas tingebat murice lanas;
occiderat mater, sed et haec de plebe suoque
aequa uiro fuerat. Lydas tamen illa per urbes
quaesierat studio nomen memorabile, quamuis
orta domo parua paruis habitabat Hypaepis.
huius ut adspicerent opus admirabile, saepe

[1] Text: W.S.Anderson (Stuttgart, 1977), slightly modified here; Translation: A.D.Melville (Oxford, 1986; paperback: Oxford, 1987).

deseruere sui nymphae uineta Timoli,
deseruere suas nymphae Pactolides undas.
nec factas solum uestes, spectare iuuabat
tum quoque cum fierent (tantus decor adfuit arti),
siue rudem primos lanam glomerabat in orbes,
seu digitis subigebat opus repetitaque longo
uellera mollibat nebulas aequantia tractu,
siue leui teretem uersabat pollice fusum,
seu pingebat acu: scires a Pallade doctam.
quod tamen ipsa negat tantaque offensa magistra
'certet' ait 'mecum! nihil est, quod uicta recusem.'

Pallas had listened to the tale she told / with warm approval of the Muses' song / and of their righteous rage. Then to herself—/ 'To praise is not enough; I should have praise / myself, not suffer my divinity / to be despised unscathed.' She had in mind / Arachne's doom, the girl of Lydia, (5) / who in the arts of wool-craft claimed renown / (so she had heard) to rival hers. The girl / had no distinction in her place of birth / or pedigree, only that special skill. / Her father was Idmon of Colophon, whose trade it was to dye the thirsty wool / with purple of Phocaea. She had lost / her mother, but she too had been low-born (10) / and matched her husband. Yet in all the towns / of Lydia Arachne's work had won / a memorable name, although her home / was humble and Hypaepae where she lived / was humble too. To watch her wondrous work / the nymphs would often leave their vine-clad slopes (15) / of Tmolus, often leave Pactolus' stream, / delighted both to see the cloth she wove / and watch her working too; such grace she had. / Forming the raw wool first into a ball, / or fingering the flock and drawing out (20) / again and yet again the fleecy cloud / in long soft threads, or twirling with her thumb, / her dainty thumb, the slender spindle, or / embroidering the pattern—you would know / Pallas had trained her. Yet the girl denied it / (a teacher so distinguished hurt her pride) / and said, 'Let her contend with me. Should I / lose, there's no forfeit that I would not pay.'

Although the story of Arachne, the weaver turned into a spider by Minerva, has received scant attention from Ovid's commentators,[1] the

[1] This was true when I wrote my article "L'épisode d'Arachné dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide", *REL* 57 (1979): 266-277; "Ovids Arachne-Erzählung", in: Actes du VII^{e} congrès de la F.I.E.C., 1 (Budapest, 1983): 457-464; on recent scholarship, cf. D.C.Feeney, *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford, 1991): 190; s. further: F.Bömer, P.Ovidius Naso, *Metamorphosen, Kommentar,* 7 vols. (Heidelberg, 1969-1986); W.Kraus, "Ovid: 1. Bericht 2. Teil (Metamorphosen)", *AAHG* 16 (1963): 1-14; M.von Albrecht, "Ovid: 2. Bericht 2. Teil (Metamorphosen)", *AAHG* 25 (1972): 267-290; M.von Albrecht, *Römische Poesie. Texte und Interpretationen* (Heidelberg, 1977): 63-79 on the Daedalus episode; M.von Albrecht, "Der Teppich als literarisches Motiv", in: *Deutsche Beiträge zur geistigen Überlieferung* 7 (1972): 11-89; H.Dörrie, "Wandlung und Dauer. Ovids Metamorphosen und Poseidonios' Lehre von der Substanz, *AU* 4, 2 (1959): 95-116; G.K.Galinsky, *Ovid's Metamorphoses. An Introduction to the Basic Aspects* (Oxford,

text is actually more representative of the poet's art and aims than has been thought.

First, the story's position in the *Metamorphoses* is significant because it is placed at the beginning of Book 6 (1-145) and thus opens the second "pentad" of the work, an indication of the importance attached to this episode by Ovid. Before it comes the punishment of the Pierides who had challenged the Muse to a musical contest, after it the stories of the punishments of impious characters who hail from very different social origins, Niobe the queen and the peasants of Lycia. Judging from the context of the episode, we expect to find in it illustrations of these themes: anger of the gods and punishment of mortals, assessment of Art, both as a gift from the gods and as an example of man's ingenuity.

Before considering how Ovid directed the reader's thoughts to these issues, it will be well to examine the structure of his narrative as a whole and certain features of its style and content (paragraphs II-IV). In this way we will better understand the psychology of the artist, as Ovid perceived it, and we will see how the introduction sets the stage which will follow.

To begin, let us recall the main details. Arachne, the famous weaver, has challenged the goddess Minerva to a contest of skill. The goddess appears in the disguise of an old woman, and advises the young woman to humble herself before the goddess. Arachne is unmoved and repeats her challenge, whereupon the goddess reveals herself in her true light, and the contest begins at once. Arachne performs her task so perfectly that not even her competitor can find fault with it (129-130). Enraged, the goddess tears her rival's work and strikes her with the shuttle. Arachne, her pride deeply wounded, hangs herself, and Pallas, touched at last by compassion, changes her into a spider.

1975): 82-83; 97; H.B.Guthmüller, *Beobachtungen zum Aufbau der Metamorphosen Ovids* (diss. Marburg, 1964): 36-38; I.Hahn, "Der Wettstreit zwischen Menschen und Göttern", in: *Antike in der soz. Kultur. Internat. Arbeitskonferenz des Inst. f. Altertumswissenschaften in der Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena* (1973), (Jena, 1974): 122-145 (richly documented); H.Hofmann, "Ausgesprochene und unausgesprochene motivische Verwebung im sechsten Metamorphosenbuch Ovids", *AClass* 14 (1971): 91-107.

E.Römisch, *Metamorphosen Ovids im Unterricht* (Heidelberg, 1976 = *Heidelberger Texte, Didaktische Reihe* 9); S.Viarre, *L'image et la pensée dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide* (Paris, 1964); S.Viarre, "L'image et le symbole dans le poésie d'Ovide. Recherches sur l'imaginaire", *REL* 52 (1974): 263-280, esp. 271; S.Viarre, *Ovide. Essai de lecture poétique* (Paris, 1976).

The author thanks Pierre Grimal and Léo Liesenborghs for their valuable advice.

Such is the story. What has Ovid done with it? Let us look at the visit of Pallas to Arachne, a scene which already reveals the nature of the Ovidian heroine.

A Change of Tense and an Epic Simile

In the introduction to the narrative let us first of all dwell on a change of tense and on an epic simile.

The narrative proper begins with Pallas' disguise as an old woman (26-27). She counsels Arachne on humility to which the latter haughtily responds: "Why doesn't she come herself?" *cur non ipsa uenit?* At once the goddess replies: "She has come" (*uenit*) and then assumes her divine form. This change of tense (made even more noticeable by the change in quantity of the syllable *ue-*) is charged with meaning. The passage from present to perfect signals, in the shortest and most brutal of ways, that Arachne's question is redundant, the answer having been anticipated by the facts.

The same scene illustrates the use of another stylistic feature, simile. Unlike the nymphs and the young women who are present at the scene, Arachne does not allow herself to be intimidated by the appeareance of the goddess. She does, however, blush—but only for a moment—as the dawn flushes before the light of the day. This comparison, borrowed from the world of colour, is thoroughly appropriate to Arachne, the great colourist. Presently, there will follow another comparison evoking a celestial phenomenon: the rainbow. In terms of form, the comparison with the colour of the dawn marks the final moment of Arachne's freedom before she makes her fateful decision. In terms of content, it is an expression of the haughtiness of her character.

To understand better the significance of this text, let us examine some key-words. Arachne does not desist from her opinion (*perstat* 50; cf. *non cedere* 6; *cede deae* 32); this is why she hastens to her ruin. Similarly, her words bear witness to her obstinacy ("I am still of the same opinion"[1] *eadem est sententia nobis* 41). Incapable of profiting from the advice given her, Arachne does not wish to admit that she has had any teacher, be it Pallas herself (24). Being a daughter of Idmon (which means "the one who knows"), Arachne is convinced that she has sufficient intelligence herself ("My own advice is all I

[1] Translation: M.M.Innes (Harmondsworth, 1955, many repr.), translation quoted in this chapter unless indicated expressly.

need"[1] *consilii satis est in me mihi* 40). But, in the end, such cleverness will turn out to be foolishness: "In her eagerness for a victory which she foolishly thought she could win, <she> rushed upon her fate" *stolidaeque cupidine palmae / in sua fata ruit* (50-51).

The structure of the scene also highlights the character of Arachne, who, on two occasions, proves unbending; for both the warning of the old woman, and the goddess' revelation become obstacles against which the young woman persists and pave the way for the dramatic catastrophe brought on by her stubbornness. Minerva, by the way, is no less haughty than her rival. Although she had warned her and given her motherly advice, she maintains a tone which is liable to provoke Arachne to the utmost. Her speech rests on two well-established ideas, the polarity between mortals and gods, and the opposition of maturity and youth. It is for the immortals to command, for humans to yield (32) and to entreat; all other behaviour is reckless (32), sacrilegious, and suicidal. Arachne, however, rejects this view, saying that the old during their long lives have gained nothing but dotage (37-38). These two women, equally obstinate, represent two worlds confronted.

Two Fabrics – Two Worlds

The comparison between the two fabrics (70-71) confirms this conclusion. In Roman literature descriptions have an intimate relationship with their contexts. In the present case, description (*ecphrasis*) serves to characterize the two rivals.

The subject of Pallas' tapestry is her victory over Neptune. The goddess does not shy away from celebrating her own glory. The council of the twelve gods confirms her triumph. Athens, the city of the goddess, is chosen as the place of the action and the olive, her sacred tree, serves as decoration. The four corners of the cloth bear pictures celebrating the punishments of human beings who had tried to equal the gods. On this tapestry, it is the humans, not the gods, who are required to change themselves. Everything is centred upon the godhead; it is the goddess who favours and who punishes; she is the queen who protects the city and enriches it.

Quite different is the design on Arachne's work. She has taken as her subject *caelestia crimina*, the crimes of deities (131). Here the gods have changed themselves into animals to mate with mortals. The

[1] Translation: A.D.Melville, with an intr. and notes by E.J.Kenney (Oxford, 1986).

perspective is completely human; all is concerned with sex, or, to use the Platonic term, the ἐπιθυμητικόν. In fact, it is not without a certain logic, from the Platonic point of view, that Arachne, after her metamorphosis, has only a very small head, the rest being an enormous belly (144). Moreover, the ivy, an erotic plant associated with Bacchus, forms the decoration of Arachne's tapestry. The latter, as a whole, has the distinct air of being a symbol of the *Metamorphoses.*

What esthetic lesson does Ovid offer in these two designs? In the work of Pallas order is supreme. A large central panel is surrounded by four smaller tableaux. Numbers play an important role: there are twelve gods and four accessory motifs. Moreover, the style of the images is described as solemn (*augusta grauitas* 73) by Ovid himself, and each god is depicted in his ideal appearance (*sua facies* 73-74). We have here a piece of art which is "official", hieratic, and political. Not only do the gods and the city occupy the centre, but the dignity of the gods is also the binding rule; for example, on one of the tableaux, two young girls are turned into stones which serve as steps to a temple (99).

In contrast, order is less perceptible on Arachne's tapestry. Instead, the images excel in extreme realism ("You would have thought that the bull was a live one, and that the waves were real waves" *uerum taurum, freta uera putares* 104). The words *sua facies* (the characteristic appearance of each being 121) are repeated but have an entirely different meaning: far from representing an ideal world, everything is adapted to reality, passion, place, and circumstances. The emphasis is on amorous passion, but there is also anguish (105-106 on the rape of Europa) and the resistance of women (*luctante* 108) violated by the gods. This is Hellenistic art, no doubt, suited to Ovid's own esthetic conception, although, as Feeney has shown, the spider imagery might imply an ironic allusion to the *genus exile.*[1] Ovid adopts the ideal of artistic perfection cherished by Hellenistic poets but abhors their exaltation of ἰσχνόν which he deemed dry and jejune.

Thus, Ovid confers on Arachne a specifically secular sensibility and, though not denying her crime, empathizes, if not sides, with her. At the same time, he reveals the unbridgeable chasm between the goddess and the mortal in their respective points of view. As in

---

[1] Feeney (quoted above, n. 1, pp. 154-155): 190-196, esp. 193. Moreover, he rightly stresses the fact that spiders are easy to destroy and therefore readily offer themselves as proofs of divine power (this argument implies, however, that gods prefer weak enemies to powerful ones).

Catullus (poem 64), it seems impossible for gods and men to find a common language. The clash between the two visions of the world is expressed with a frankness stripped of illusions and a brutality which has a modern ring to it.

A Case of Reversed Darwinism

How to explain the metamorphosis of Arachne? Shall we call it a punishment? But it is Arachne who hangs herself. If anything, she falls victim to her pride, both the strongest and the most dangerous of her qualities, and, in the end, punishes herself; in fact, Pallas, it seems, by replacing death with metamorphosis, almost does her a favour. This metamorphosis confirms the discovery of Dörrie according to whom Ovidian metamorphoses perpetuate a *hexis,* a behaviour which, as a result of long habit, has become a fixed attitude.[1] The ancients regarded such metamorphoses as *exempla* and *monumenta,* solemn warnings.

Thus, we see an almost natural process developing: Arachne is a human being who knows only one pursuit; her abilities place her above others, a fact which causes her to forget the respect owed to the old and to divinities and ultimately excludes her from human society; by becoming a specialist, she gives up the versatility which is one of man's privileges; in return, more and more she resembles an animal which has but one faculty and develops it to perfection. It is instructive to compare the free behaviour of man with the fixed attitude proper to an animal. In Ovid, the result is a kind of "reverse Darwinism" which had been already known to Plato.

A Female Artist's Identity

We are now better able to penetrate the meaning of the beginning of our text (1-25). Minerva, who has listened to the Muse relating the punishment of the Pierides, energetically shares in the goddess' anger ("She expressed her approval ... of their righteous indignation" *iustamque probauerat iram* 1-2). From the beginning, the theme of the

---

[1] H.Dörrie (quoted above, n. 1, pp. 154-155); the fact that the Ancients did not regard the spider's work as art (Feeney, 194, with reference to Seneca, *Epist.* 121. 23), in my view, is not the reason why Ovid wrote this story; it is rather a corollary to it. Ovid does not ridicule Hellenistic art (he explicitly states that neither Pallas nor Envy personified could find fault with Arachne's work), but he shows how art degenerates into technology and a reproduction of stereotypes unworthy of man.

wrath of the gods, which will dominate the following myths, is emphasized, not only to introduce these myths, but also (and in a somewhat surprising manner) to serve as a backdrop for the entire action. Minerva says: "It is not enough to praise other people: what I want is to be praised myself, and not to have others scorn my divine powers with impunity" (3-4). So, the intention of revenge was already present in the goddess, even before a definite motive presented itself. Unlike the Muses, who only punished the Pierides and King Pyreneus after they had been provoked, Minerva wants to execute justice before she has found a victim, and it is only now that she turns to Arachne and considers destroying the Maeonian (*Maeoniaeque animum fatis intendit Arachnes*), who, she had been told, would not yield to her in the art of weaving wool (5-7). *Fatum* in Ovid ordinarily means an unhappy lot, death; therefore, even before the first encounter between Arachne and the goddess, it is already certain that Arachne is going to perish. The key-word *fatis*, moreover, has a narrative function: it announces the somber finale of the episode. As for Arachne, Ovid first speaks of her artistic talents, which are comparable to those of Pallas ("Who in the arts of woolcraft claimed renown (so she had heard) to rival hers" *quam sibi lanificae non cedere laudibus artis / audierat*[1] 6). Here, *non cedere* means "to be not inferior to"; but, there is also a subjective undertone, "not to yield"—the first allusion to Arachne's inflexibility which will speed her to her end. However, there is, as yet, no question of provocation; it is rather as a result of Arachne's skill, art, and fame that the goddess is angered.

Discovering Human Creativity

Furthermore, in an indirect way, Ovid makes us understand the pride felt by the artist. Of humble origin, the daughter of a small village cloth-dyer (13), Arachne owes all of her prestige, all that she is, to her art (8). What is more, her work is appreciated even by divine beings: it arouses the curiosity of the neighbouring nymphs who leave their mountains or rivers to admire not only the finished fabrics, but also the process—to them a mystery—of production. First, balls of raw wool are formed by working it with the fingers; next, the strands are drawn in several strokes and, finally, the yarn is spun to weave a tapestry. Ovid watches these activities through the eyes of entranced

[1] See n. 1, pp. 154-155.

divine beings who admire the methodical work of the mortal woman. Such a technique, for those who are ignorant of it, takes on something of the miraculous. Ovid is generally aware of the poetic side of technology; we need recall here only the furnaces of the forge, the kilns mentioned in the Medea episode (7. 106-110), and the water pipe in the story of Pyramus and Thisbe (4. 122-124). Arachne's knowledge is defined by (and confined to) her technological skills. Ovid is the poet of human effort, though also of its limitations; it suffices to recall the story of the Minyads who were punished for working on a religious holiday (4. 1-415). To the ancients, the genius of the artist is a divine gift ("It was easy to see that she had been taught by Pallas" *scires a Pallade doctam* 23).[1] Arachne, however, believed herself to be the sole author of her work (24). Here Ovid is developing the notion of man as creator and in that is anticipating the philosophers who did not arrive at this idea until well after the heroic era, towards the end of classical antiquity. Our text bears witness to the fact that human creativity was part of the Roman experience. Contrary to the expectations of his readers, Ovid does not start with a provocation of Minerva on the part of Arachne; for only at the end of the first section does she vow that she is ready to endure anything, if she is defeated (*nihil est quod uicta recusem* 25).

The reader, therefore, is prepared to sympathize with Arachne's reactions. Unlike Athena, who was born a goddess, Arachne never had the privileges which come with birth. Her dignity rests solely upon her work, and it is for this reason that she is unwilling to concede one iota of superiority to the goddess without first putting her to the test. To Arachne the contest which she proposed was not sacrilegious: she believed that she was offering her opponent a real chance. The story of Arachne's life shed light on her way of thinking and helps the reader to understand why the weaver was so completely aloof of theological considerations, why she could not understand that the goddess who personifies the art of weaving must not be treated on an equal footing with a mortal. Failure to admit this undermined Arachne's art and hastened her ruin.

On the other hand, the portrait which Ovid paints of Minerva is of a goddess who is anything but indulgent. Nor does he give any detail concerning Arachne's apprenticeship with Minerva, a period which

---

[1] I do not understand Feeney's (quoted above, n. 1, pp. 154-155: 194) retrospective interpretation of this line. Actually Arachne was never brought to her senses by Minerva (neither before nor after her metamorphosis).

seems to have equally faded away from the memory of both of them. If Arachne conducts herself in a manner appropriate to her social standing, the same goes for Minerva. The goddess' first concern is for her reputation ("What I want is to be praised myself" *laudemur et ipsae* 3). Her thoughts are dominated by hierarchical categories and the design on her tapestry is proof of this, as noted above. Nonetheless, she treats the mortal woman as a rival. What a strange teacher who does not rejoice in the progress of his student! What a strange deity who is not proud of her creation! What a want of *pietas*, not only on the part of Arachne, but also of Minerva! It is as if they confronted each other like representatives of two socially different classes, each one ready to prove her superiority. The two of them are stripped of any real humanity, yet each preserves some all too human traits, pettiness, aggressiveness, narrow-mindedness, traits which, amazingly, invite the reader to think of this legend as the myth of a struggle between two artists of differing social status (although this does not give a full account of the story).

Giving Guidance to the Reader

The introduction to the episode which we have just analyzed prepares and announces the narrative under various headings:

1. Ovid's presentation of two characters, each set in her ways, prepares for the conflict and the dramatic finale.

2. Divine anger is not depicted in an entirely positive light, and the stubbornness of the young woman is explained by psychological and social motives. The myth is transposed from the realm of theology into a sociological setting, the two characters representing two diverse concepts of human society of which the one is hierarchical, the other oriented towards material and economic efficiency.

3. The problem of art is addressed in the widest sense: man, the rational being, by his technical exploits excites the admiration and the jealousy of the gods. Ovid, however, does not feel even this theme to be relevant to theology; rather, it is offered from an anthropological and social point of view.

4. In his introduction the poet shows that Arachne owes all to her art; consequently, she is inclined to make it the exclusive measure of her self-worth. Her personality is absorbed in her work. The same is true of Pallas; in this way Ovid sets the scene for the tragic conflict which will follow.

5. Even the metamorphosis of Arachne seems to have been prepared for as early as the introduction, where Ovid speaks less of weaving than of spinning (21). It is intriguing that the artist's fingers to which Ovid had alluded in 20 and 22 will be mentioned again on the occasion of the metamorphosis ("Her slender fingers were fastened to her sides, to serve as legs" *in latere exiles digiti pro cruribus haerent* 143) where, metaphorically, they will form the legs of the spider. This slightly surprising and bizarre detail confirms the bond of union between the portrayal of Arachne's character at the beginning of the story and the physical materialization of this character in the final metamorphosis.

Greatness and Misery of Artists

Let us try to draw some conclusions of more general import. First, we will compare Arachne to some other Ovidian characters.

Unlike the impious characters whose stories were told in the preceding book, Arachne is neither tyrannical (as was Pyreneus) nor a bad artist (as were the Pierides); her work is flawless ("Neither Pallas nor even Jealousy personified could find any flaw in the work" *non illud Pallas, non illud carpere Liuor possit opus* 129-130). Arachne, the perfect artist, most closely resembles Niobe, the perfect mother—too perfect even—too sure of her perfection, too little mindful of her mortality. These two women provide two examples of extremely successful lives which excite the jealousy of the gods. Unlike Pygmalion, another type of artist, Arachne lacks respect for and piety towards the gods. The very perfection of her craft excludes her from human society. She is absorbed in her art, guilty of indifference to life. Such was Arachne, offending the old woman who was a goddess; such too was Daedalus who killed his pupil Perdix because the glory of art was more important to him than humanity. By revealing only gradually the shortcomings of the artists, in both of these narratives, Ovid lets his readers sympathize with the heroes from the outset, an effect even compounded in Arachne's case by psychological and social explanations of her character. Ovid shows us that the artist's glory and misery are inexorably tied to and flow from the same source; as the poet said when speaking of his own destiny: "It was through my own talent that I perished" *ingenio perii Naso poeta meo* (*Trist.* 3. 74). There is, then, some mysterious affinity uniting Ovid with his characters. For him, the artist symbolizes the man who, thanks to technology, attains an almost superhuman greatness and, at the same time, runs headlong

to his destruction. As at the end of Catullus' epyllion, in Ovid the worlds of gods and men oppose each other, dialogue is impossible. Just as Arachne knows nothing of this world, so Minerva thinks only in terms of hierarchical structures. The man who knows nothing of the gods receives them with fear; he feels exposed, threatened, and, at the end, fiercely readies himself for death. In this pitiless world the kind gesture of the goddess, who picks up the hanging woman and changes her into a spider, is tinged with irony.

The great emphasis which Ovid places on the power of the goddess is, no doubt, explained by the political climate of his own times, which witnessed proscription and the devolvement of extraordinary powers upon one single man. Nevertheless, in criticising this hierarchical order, Ovid does not revolt; he does not question the power of the gods. This, however, does not prevent him from being sensitive to the torment of the individual who does not submit and to the tragedy of lofty and independent personalities.

Individualist though he was, Ovid possessed no less a sense of moderation. For him there is an ordering principle to the world according to which the consequences of a human action fall upon its perpetrator, a sense of shame which shuns extreme remedies and emotions and, despite a scepticism of an almost modern hue, a certain respect for the unknown. In these qualities, Ovid is close to Euripides and Menander.

But let us not forget that Ovid was a Roman. Ovid freed epic from the fetters of religion and politics. The emphasis he laid on the human aspects of the events which he was relating, his pity for women and beaten enemies, are features he has in common with Livy. No doubt, his training in rhetoric and his experience with elegiac poetry enabled him to endow ancient myths with a purely human quality. In the present case, empathy led him to the point of changing the meaning of an edifying legend; instead of the punishment for sacrilegious pride, Ovid stresses the greatness and the misery of the creative individual, as well as the opposition between a hierarchical society and a society based exclusively on labour. Finally, he dares to pose a disquieting question: what will become of a man who knows nothing but his work?

Epilogue: The most important task of an introduction is to make the reader benevolent, attentive, and ready to learn. We have seen that Ovid perfectly achieves his aim and how he does so. By starting with

Pallas' determination to punish someone he dissociates as much as possible the connection between divine anger and Arachne's guilt. This artificial ordering of facts in the introduction is comparable to techniques used in pleas. Moreover, he gives us a valid social reason for the weaver's pride and thus encourages the reader to side with the human being rather than with the goddess. It would, however, be a futile task to confine our text to the functions of prefaces or epilogues listed in textbooks of rhetoric; Ovid's technique by which he guides his reader should be studied in a larger context.

In the present episode, intertextual relationships (in the narrower sense of the word) are to be viewed, first of all, within the whole of the *Metamorphoses.* The Arachne story may be considered both an epilogue to the first pentad of books and a preface to the second. By its key position, it is to be compared with the epilogue to the second pentad (Orpheus' death, which, being an appendix to Book 10, is placed at the beginning of Book 11), and with the epilogue to the entire work (which is an appendix to Book 15), where Ovid discusses his own death and immortality. The position of these three epilogues is telling in itself and gives the reader some additional clues: in retrospect, he will understand even better Ovid's pity for Arachne. However, Ovid limits himself to giving the story (and the two parallel texts) equally prominent positions and thereby spares himself the trouble of drawing explicit parallels. "Position" is in itself a highly meaningful element of the "language" of intertextuality.

On a more abstract ("intercultural") level, Ovid was highly intrigued with the conflict between a hierarchic view of the world and a more modern one in which the dignity of a person is built on its labour and its merits. Here it is surprising to observe how he succeeded in reading an old story of hybris almost against its original intention and in re-telling it in a way to reflect two antagonistic views of the world of two talented woman, one divine, the other human, and in doing so he gave prominence to a new idea, human crea-tivity.

It is by enacting a conflict between irreconcilably divergent social, religious, and artistic codes that he changes an old edifying legend into a tragedy which conveys to his readers a "modern" artist's greatness and misery. A further dimension ("intertextual" in the broadest sense of the word) is provided by the political background of Ovid's own days: the power of gods (and goddesses) in fiction is described in terms reflecting the real power of the Emperor (and his family). Ovid's readers did not need a commentary to understand this.

3. Elocutio. *Similes in Ovid's* Metamorphoses *and Their Functions*

Studies on Ovid's similes have not been numerous, and their authors have concentrated more on the number of similes and their motifs than on their narrative function.[1] During the last decades there appeared excellent monographs in which Ovid's originality was stressed; it suffices to cite the names of Georges Lafaye, Walther Kraus, Hermann Fränkel, and L.P.Wilkinson.[2] Attention has been paid to Ovid's narrative art ever since Richard Heinze's famous monograph.[3] Yet the narrative function of the similes does not seem to have received a full appraisal. In a Heidelberg seminar my students and I studied all of the similes in the *Metamorphoses*; for this article I have chosen some typical examples.

Channelling the Reader's Expectations

Met. 1. 490-496

> Phoebus amat uisaeque cupit conubia Daphnes,
> quodque cupit, sperat, suaque illum oracula fallunt,
> utque leues stipulae demptis adolentur aristis,
> ut facibus saepes ardent, quas forte uiator
> uel nimis admouit uel iam sub luce reliquit,
> sic deus in flammas abiit, sic pectore toto
> uritur et sterilem sperando nutrit amorem.

---

[1] J.A.Washietl, *De similitudinibus imaginibusque Ovidianis* (diss. Wien, 1883); S.G.Owen, "Ovid's Use of the Simile", *CR* 45 (1931): 97-106; E.G.Wilkins, "A Classification of the Similes of Ovid", *CW* 25 (1932): 73-78; 81-86; fruitful D.F.Bauer, "The Function of Pygmalion in the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid", *TAPhA* 93 (1962): 1-21; T.F.Brunner, "The Function of the Simile in Ovid's Metamorphoses", *CJ* 61 (1955/6): 354-363.

[2] G.Lafaye, *Les Métamorphoses d'Ovide et leurs modèles grecs* (Paris, 1904, repr. Hildesheim, 1971); W.Kraus, "Ovidius Naso", *RE* 18, 2, 1942, 1910-1986, revised in: *Ovid*, edd. M.von Albrecht and E.Zinn (Darmstadt, 1968 = *Wege der Forschung*, 92): 67-166; H.Fränkel, *Ovid, A Poet Between Two Worlds* (Berkeley, 1945); L.P.Wilkinson, *Ovid Recalled* (Cambridge, 1955); G. K.Galinsky, *Ovid's Metamorphoses. An Introduction to the Basic Aspects* (Oxford 1975).

[3] R.Heinze, *Ovids elegische Erzählung. Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, phil.-hist. Klasse*, 71 (Leipzig, 1919); T.Döscher, *Ovidius Narrans. Studien zur Erzählkunst Ovids in den Metamorphosen* (diss. Heidelberg, 1971); see also M.von Albrecht, "Zur Funktion der Tempora in Ovids elegischer Erzählung", in: *Ovid, op. cit.* n. 2; older is H.Peters, *Symbola ad Ovidii artem epicam cognoscendam* (diss. Göttingen, 1908). I purposely do not deal with the debated problem of "epic" and "elegiac" narrative in this paper. For this, see my "Forschungsbericht", in: *AAHG* 25 (1972): 267-290.

Phoebus loves Daphne at sight, and longs to wed her; and what he longs for, that he hopes; and his own gifts of prophecy deceive him. And as the stubble of the harvested grain is kindled, as hedges burn with the torches which some traveller has chanced to put too near, or has gone off and left at break of day, so was the god consumed with flames, so did he burn in all his heart, and feed his fruitless love on hope.[1]

1. After beholding Daphne's beauty, Apollo falls in love. This process develops in stages; accordingly, the sentences grow longer and longer:

> Phoebus amat
> uisaeque cupit conubia Daphnes,
> quodque cupit, sperat, suaque illum oracula fallunt.

The passage is lively and dynamic, full of brisk movement. Then follows a simile comparing Apollo's emotion to a bushfire consuming a dry fence. It stresses the suddenness and the lightning speed of the passion which seizes the god. Rarely does Ovid compare objects at rest; he likes to discover movement everywhere and indulges in describing its different shades.

2. There is a contrast between simile and context. The simile transfers the reader to a different sphere: instead of the mythical world, he is surrounded by nature; instead of heroes, he observes simple people at work. This contrast of subject matter invites the reader to reflect and to discover what these different spheres have in common. We will come back to the difference between Ovid and Homer in this respect. For the moment, let us say that for Ovid the contrasts between narrative and simile are a source of original poetic inspiration.

3. Let us now consider the position of the simile within its context. It marks a crucial moment: the kindling of love at the sight of beauty or, to put it more abstractly, an external quality of one character giving rise to the emotion of another. This is the birth of the force which will promote the drama. Ovid frequently enhances such moments with similes: Mercury, while flying, becomes instantly enamoured of Herse, like a piece of lead shot from a sling that becomes hot on its way through the air (2. 727-729); Tereus is seized by passion as stubbles or hay are caught by flames (6. 455-457).

Such similes tend to elaborate on ideas which precede them. At the same time they prepare the reader for things to come, by seizing, at

---

[1] Translation: F.J.Miller (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1916, repr. 1977).

its very origin, the emotion which will become the driving force of the following narrative. This simile is placed shortly after the beginning of the narrative. In this position, it allows the poet to show how he understands the following story and to channel the reader's expectations in the desired direction.

Enhancing Myth by Appealing to Reality

Met. 1. 199-205

> Confremuere omnes studiique ardentibus ausum
> talia deposcunt: sic, cum manus inpia saeuit
> sanguine Caesareo Romanum exstinguere nomen,
> attonitum tantae subito terrore ruinae
> humanum genus est totusque perhorruit orbis;
> nec tibi grata minus pietas, Auguste, tuorum est
> quam fuit illa Ioui.

All clamoured, and with eager zeal demanded him who had been guilty of such bold infamy. So, when an impious band was mad to blot out the name of Rome with Caesar's blood, the human race was dazed with a sudden fear of mighty ruin, and the whole world shuddered in horror. Nor is the loyalty of thy subjects, Augustus, less pleasing to thee than that was to Jove.

1. In the assembly preceding the great flood, Jupiter tells the gods that Lycaon tried to assassinate him, and a storm of indignation follows. This reaction reminds Ovid of the world's horror in the face of an assault on Caesar (probably Augustus). Both the human and the divine ruler are equally pleased at this token of piety. The simile reflects the situation from two successive viewpoints: first the effect of Jupiter's speech on the assembly and then the effect produced by this reaction on Jupiter. This is, as it were, a double echo to Jupiter's mention of Lycaon's assault. At the same time these lines serve as a calculated pause before words of thematic importance.[1] The name of Lycaon is equally stressed by its final position in Jupiter's speech. Ovid is interested in the relationship between the speaker and his audience and in the psychological aspect of speech and literature in general, problems which belong to the field of rhetoric, in the widest sense of the word.

---

[1] In the prologue of Menander's *Samia*, the character who gives the play its title is introduced by a parenthesis; cf. my *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion* (Hildesheim, 1964, 2nd ed. 1994 = *Spudasmata*, 7).

The present simile reflects the thoughts and feelings of a given character, a function which some similes have in Homer,[1] but which is more common in Apollonius Rhodius.[2] Note also the change of perspective in our simile, which is typically Ovidian.

2. All this does not yet explain why Jupiter is compared to Augustus. What is the relationship between myth and historical reality? One might assume that a god's dignity is impaired if he is compared to a human. Roman readers seem to have felt differently, however: was not Augustus the ruler of the world, the *nomen Romanum* incarnate (1. 201), the most powerful being? The reappearance of this simile in the last book of the *Metamorphoses*[3] shows that the political authority is juxtaposed to the mythical god governing the macrocosm. Ovid has a high opinion of man and tries to revitalize the mythical gods by mirroring human experience in them and by letting human blood flow in their veins. Ovid imparts to myth a purely human meaning.

3. By its position in the context, the simile serves as a kind of pause, stressing the importance of the preceding words. The structure of this paragraph brings to mind the rings formed by a stone thrown into water. The indignation of the gods heralds Jupiter's wrath, which is the main theme of the following tale. Such convergencies of functions, of form, and of content are frequent in Ovid. Our second example of a simile placed shortly after the beginning of a story confirms the conclusion drawn from our first example.

Let us now turn to two instances of similes placed in the middle of the story.

Enlivening Dull Moments

Met. 6. 514-518

> Exsultatque et uix animo sua gaudia differt
> barbarus et nusquam lumen detorquet ab illa,
> non aliter quam cum pedibus praedator obuncis
> deposuit nido leporem Iouis ales in alto;
> nulla fuga est capto, spectat sua praemia raptor.

---

[1] Wilamowitz has correctly noted that one function of similes is to reflect atmosphere; see H.Fränkel, *Die homerischen Gleichnisse* (Göttingen, 1921): III and 5 ff.

[2] D.Bussenius, *De Valeri Flacci in adhibendis comparationibus usu* (diss. Jena, 1872).

[3] In Books 1 and 7 of the *Aeneid*, the spheres of the narrative and of the simile are interchanged (sea storm and political life: *Aen.* 1. 148-156; 7. 586-590; 594).

The barbarous fellow triumphs, he can scarce postpone his joys, and never turns his eyes from her, as when the ravenous bird of Jove has dropped in his high eyrie some hare caught in his hooked talons; the captive has no chance to escape, the captor gloats over his prize.

How does Ovid enliven dull moments in his narrative? Tereus, with Philomela, is sailing from Athens to his kingdom; he gazes at her as an eagle looks at a hare brought into its nest. Since there is nothing to be told about the routine sail from Athens to Thrace, the external action has reached a dull point, a disadvantage which the poet turns into an advantage by inserting this simile. It produces a double perspective by having the reader turn from the material world to the realm of the human psyche and with that from the present to the future. By probing into the impatient expectations of Tereus, Ovid outpaces his own narrative; the fact that the victim in the simile is already in the eagle's nest foreshadows the hopelessness of Philomela's situation. What could have been a dull moment becomes a moment full of psychological tension: the less that happens, the more torturing the suspense. Of course, subtle art is needed to convey this feeling to the reader.

The following example is also found in the middle of a narrative; its aim, however, is not enlivenment but retardation.

Creating Suspense

Met. 1. 533-539

Vt canis in uacuo leporem cum Gallicus aruo
uidit, et hic praedam pedibus petit, ille salutem;
alter inhaesuro similis iam iamque tenere
sperat et extento stringit uestigia rostro,
alter in ambiguo est, an sit conprensus, et ipsis
morsibus eripitur tangentiaque ora relinquit:
sic deus et uirgo est hic spe celer, illa timore.

Just as when a Gallic hound has seen a hare in an open plain, and seeks his prey on flying feet, but the hare, safety; (535) he, just about to fasten on her, now, even now thinks he has her, and grazes her very heels with his outstretched muzzle; but she knows not whether she be not already caught, and barely escapes from those sharp fangs and leaves behind the jaws just closing on her: so ran the god and maid, he sped by hope and she by fear.

Phoebus pursues Daphne like a hound chasing a hare. This is a venerable epic simile (recall Hector and Achilles: *Il.* 22. 189-193 or Turnus and Aeneas: *Aen.* 12. 749-755). Ovid transforms it into a series

of antitheses based on two opposite emotions: the pursuer is lifted on the wings of hope, the pursued on the wings of fear. In this form, the antithesis of fear and hope seems to be an innovation in the epic simile.[1] Ovid has oriented this passage around the expression of two emotions promoting the action.

At which point in the narrative is the simile placed? Ovid chooses the moment when everything is still possible, the state of suspense before the irrevocable has happened. Thus, the simile dwells on the last moments of freedom, the last margin left to free will. Ovid has a keen awareness of suspenseful situations before the *peripeteia* and often enlarges on these by introducing similes or other poetic devices such as monologues. Similes, especially when in the middle of narrative, serve to retard the action.

Clash of Contexts: An Icon in Unexpected Company

At this point it is appropriate to add some remarks concerning the generic character and the stylistic level of similes.

For Ovid the epic simile is a poetic device with a history of its own and a specific value acquired in the course of that history. In this respect it does not resemble an ordinary picture but an old and precious icon; when using a simile, a poet must take into account its past. Ovid stresses the "epic" character of some passages by the use of appropriate similes. For example, just as the *Aeneid* starts with the word *arma* and then a sea storm, so at the beginning of Book 5 of the *Metamorphoses* (which, in its first half, is epic in the strict sense of the word), Ovid uses the key-word *arma* and a sea storm simile (*Met.* 5. 1-7) to make the reader expect a certain stylistic level. Similarly, the poet gives to Books 12 and 13, the Trojan Books of the *Metamorphoses*, epic flavour by adapting similes drawn from Homer and Virgil.[2] In Book 11 by evoking the image of a beleaguered city (11. 508-553) in connection with a shipwreck at sea, Ovid elevates the private fate of Ceyx to the level of a great military or political act. Ovid thinks that stories of marital love such as Ceyx', despite their private character, are worthy of description in epic format.

---

[1] Cf. M.von Albrecht, *op. cit.* n. 1, p. 168: 180 and H.G.Finke, *Furcht und Hoffnung als antithetische Denkform von Plautus bis Tacitus* (diss. Tübingen, 1950): 128.

[2] Mars: *Met.* 12. 91; *Aen.* 12. 332; a rock: *Met.* 12. 124; *Aen.* 6. 471; a captured city: *Met.* 12. 225; *Aen.* 4. 669; *Aen.* 2 *passim*; a bull: *Met.* 12. 248; *Aen.* 2. 223 f.; burning crops: *Met.* 12. 274; *Aen.* 2. 304; hail: *Met.* 12. 480; *Aen.* 5. 458; the lioness and her cub: *Met.* 13. 547; Homer, *Il.* 18. 318 (very typical of the epic wrath-motif).

Yet archaic devices in literature are liable to produce not only tragic but comic effects; sometimes it is only a small step from the sublime to the ridiculous. Not by chance, Dostoevsky has one of his characters say: "I am in earnest although I use Slavonic words."[1] Ovid would not be Ovid if he limited himself only to a serious use of the epic simile. He clearly savours the contrast between the grand style of these similes and the un-epic action of their contexts; take not only Ceyx's tragic death, but even the embraces of the Hermaphroditus and the nymph Salmacis.[2] Having written an *Art of Love*, Ovid knows that circumstantial descriptions in this field are tolerable only when accompanied by some slight irony. Ovid's ironic pathos paves the way to great epic poets of modern times such as Ariosto, Byron, and Pushkin, all of whom saved epic from declining into dull imitation by giving it a personal touch.

Discovering the Poetic Side of Technology

Met. 4. 121-124

> Vt iacuit resupinus humo, cruor emicat alte,
> non aliter quam cum uitiato fistula plumbo
> scinditur et tenui stridente foramine longas
> eiaculatur aquas atque ictibus aëra rumpit.

As he lay stretched upon the earth the spouting blood leaped high; just as when a pipe has broken at a weak spot in the lead and through the small hissing aperture sends spurting forth long streams of water, cleaving the air with its jets.

Our last example is from the famous story of Pyramus and Thisbe. Unlike Shakespeare, Ovid treated it seriously. After a moving speech, Pyramus kills himself. At the moment when he draws the sword out of the wound the blood spurts high into the air like water from a damaged pipe. Such a simile would be inconceivable in Virgil, who, as the humanist Vida noticed in his *Poetics* 1. 12, preserves dignity and avoids images which might look trivial or ridiculous. By his severe taste, Virgil is removed from the ingenuousness of Homer who had compared Ajax to a stubborn donkey (*Il.* 11. 558), the Greek warriors to flies around a milk pail (*Il.* 16. 641, cf. 2. 469), and sleepless Ulysses

---

1 *Demons* 3. 3. 2; Collected Works 7 (Moscow, 1957): 549.
2 *Met.* 4. 362-364. Note the venerable image of the eagle and the snake being used in an erotic context, cf. *Aen.* 11. 751-756; *Il.* 12. 200-207.

to a black pudding being turned in roasting (*Od.* 20. 25). The different standards of acceptability might be due to differences between Greek and Roman society since they are also evident if we compare the dialogues of Cicero and Plato. All the more revealing is Ovid's independence, even in a fastidious genre like Roman epic.

Why does Ovid free himself from Virgil's severity? Why does he return to Homer's more colourful realism?

1. In our example the simile adds to the credibility of the narrative. Actually at this point the all too realistic image is not unnecessary: the change of colour and the fruits on the tree can only be explained if the blood spurts very high. The mundaneness of the image together with its technical character make the story more plausible to the reader. The appeal to technical processes helps to explain fabulous elements; similarly, the fiery force and noisy breath of the brass-footed bulls, who are to be tamed by Jason, are compared to forges and lime-kilns (7. 106-110). Human work and technology are liable to give an idea of a mythic phenomenon since technical achievements sometimes seem to border on the miraculous. Striving to add to myth a maximum of credibility, Ovid, incidentally, discovered the poetry of the technical world.[1] His intention to make the fantastic realm of myth understandable to the Romans is also evidenced in the way he described many metamorphoses. Ovid gives himself an air of scientific exactitude with a subject that defies not only natural science but nature itself. How does one explain to an educated Roman that a man being thrown into the water changes into a stone, and while flying? Ovid is not at a loss to find a "scientific" explanation even for this: as rain in a cold wind becomes snow and swirling snowflakes cluster together into hailstones, thus Lichas whirled by Hercules through the air, becoming bloodless and, as it were, dried out through fear, is turned into a stone (9. 220-225; cf. Enn. *trag.* 356-360 Jocelyn). In this case the physical explanation is enriched by a psychological one. Does the poet, when unexpectedly switching from one sphere into another, not resemble a musician who, through enharmonic modulation, suddenly changes to a distant key?

2. This accounts for the use of similes from technology. There remains the emotional contrast. Immediately after having aroused compassion for Pyramus, Ovid compares the unfortunate young man

---

[1] The Homeric "automats" (cf. *Il.* 18. 373-379) and the "sampo" of the Finnish *Kalevala* are technological fantasies. Different kinds of craftmanship are mentioned in Homeric similes.

to a water pipe. The marked sobriety, even coldness, of the simile compells the reader to detach himself from what happened, to forget dramatic compassion and lyric empathy (feelings which had been required of him up to now), and to return to epic objectivity. This is one of the instances in which the reader's illusion is dispelled in a rude awakening.

To counterbalance the intense, emotional impact of other passages it was necessary for Ovid to strive for distance, that is, to combine Virgilian subjectivity and Homeric objectivity, as was his aim. In this simile, Ovid might be compared to a painter who, for a moment, steps back from his picture to take a critical look at it by adopting the spectator's view. The reader will not be surprised that such similes explaining metamorphoses are preferably placed towards the end of stories.

Conclusions

In Homer the simile is an indispensable tool of knowledge rather than an ornament. For a moment the poet leaves the world of myth and meditatively pursues a parallel event from everyday life. Paralleling not only isolated facts but entire processes, he gradually approaches an abstract thought based on experience. It is in this way that the Homeric similes prepare the ground for philosophic thought and the inductive methods of science.[1]

Between Homer and Ovid there is the entire development of Greek philosophy. To Ovid, as to many of us, abstract notions more readily suggest themselves than do images. In Hellenistic times this development comes to bear upon the attitude of poets and critics towards the simile: it is considered not so much a tool of knowledge as a device of poetic technique. In theory and practice, authors tend to eliminate the so-called superfluous elements which originally had contributed to give a complete picture of the event by rendering fully the actual process of experience. Rationally concentrating on the analogies between narrative and simile, the poet can limit himself to the point he has in mind; the reader need not pursue all the details

---

[1] The philosophical implications of the Homeric simile are stressed by K. Riezler, "Das homerische Gleichnis und der Anfang der Philosophie", *Die Antike* 12 (1936): 253-271; Fränkel, quoted above n. 1, p. 169, saw that the *tertium comparationis* is not limited to one single "point" and that the simile repeats, as it were, the same melody on another instrument.

of the event imagined in the comparison in order to grasp the idea. Consequently, similes become shorter than they are in Homer, and, instead, the poets more frequently employ entire chains of comparisons. Since Ovid tries to adapt the simile as far as possible to the main action, sometimes, except for the characters and the place of action, there seems to be no noticeable difference between narrative and simile (consider the mention of an assault on the ruler in the assembly of gods compared to the same event in the senate). It is as if the simile were condemned to be nothing other than a colourless copy of the main event. However, the loss of the logical indispensability of the simile does not inevitably lead to impoverishment; Roman poets managed to restore the poetic power of similes by dwelling on the contrast between the simile and its context and more consciously elaborating its symbolic aspects. In the *Aeneid*, as Viktor Pöschl has shown,[1] the similes shed light on the structure and the meaning of the poem as a whole. To achieve this, the 'secondary functions' of the simile are exploited on a large scale.

Ovid had to proceed from this state of affairs. What aspects of the simile did he cherish most? Ovidian similes are liable to excite compassion in a Virgilian vein, but also to exclude it. Sober observation and realism, sometimes carried to the extreme, seem to bring Ovid closer to Homer. Yet their methods of work are opposite: for Homer the simile is a way of arriving at an idea whereas Ovid starts from the idea and incorporates it in the simile. To the former poet the idea is a final result, to the latter a point of departure.

The narrative function of Ovid's similes can be explained in terms of their position within the story. Placed shortly after the beginning, a simile introduces the emotions which will promote the action and may even foreshadow its fateful conclusion. In a central position, a simile enlivens dull moments or effects retardation by dwelling on the last moment before the decisive event. Towards the end of the story, similes enhance the credibility of mythic metamorphoses and, by force of its objectivity, encourage the reader to detach himself from the events in order to look at them from a distance. Doubtless a comparative history of narrative structures will bring to light more information. It is striking that similes usually do not appear either in the first or in the last line of Ovid's stories. Unlike some examples of

---

[1] *Die Dichtkunst Virgils* (Wiesbaden, 1950; 3rd ed. Berlin, 1977; Engl. translation Ann Arbor, 1962); very valuable also: M.von Duhn, *Die Gleichnisse in den ersten sechs Büchern von Virgils Aeneis* (diss. Hamburg, 1952).

Slavic epic, which immediately confront the unprepared listener with a rather enigmatic simile, thus creating a mysterious lyric atmosphere, Ovid prepares his similes and explains them and therein shows a clear preference for a rational approach. Yet for him the simile is neither a step towards understanding (as it had been to Homer) nor material for symbolic architecture (as it had been to Virgil). Ovid is a keen and sober observer of reality, of the psychological motives behind human actions, especially of man's situation before a decision, through which he will realize his liberty and by realizing it loose it. The poet exploits contrasts between simile and context, and plays on Homeric and Virgilian reminiscences to convey pathos or irony. The linguistic and meta-linguistic resources of rhetoric and intertextuality help him to express the subtlest nuances of meaning and to change his poem into a dialogue both with his great predecessors and with his sympathetic readers. His firm belief in life and human creativity makes him aware of the dimension of history. He injects poetic life into the vanishing gods and all the realms of nature, not by sacrificial blood as Ulysses had done in his necromancy, but by his thoughts and feelings, and in doing so he gives to the world the precious gift only a poet can give.

Epilogue: For the orator, similes are means to produce ἐνάργεια (*euidentia*, graphic vividness). They are meant to guide the listener and to influence his understanding of what is being said, an aim which falls into the domain of rhetoric. Even in style, the antithetic structure of some Ovidian similes may reveal rhetorical influence (e.g. *Met.* 1. 535; 539). However, the categories of rhetoric do not fully explain Ovid's use of similes. The poetic design and calculated distribution (οἰκονομία) of similes over his narrative is all his own and can be described much better in the framework of textual syntax and of genre.

In terms of intertextuality, Ovid's use of similes sometimes reveals an irreverent play on contrasts between traditionally disparate levels of style or genre, e.g., by transposing a sublime epic simile into an erotic context. That Ovid was fond of playing on his readers' expectations by surprising or even shocking them can be seen in his application of some animal similes, which in the epic tradition had acquired a certain venerable dignity, to rather un-heroic situations. Emotionally these contrasts create some distance between the story and the reader and challenge him to reflect. On a more abstract level the epic simile must be considered a type of text which, by definition, establishes interferences between different cultural codes: originally it

invites the reader to compare a heroic episode to the every day life of artisans or even animals. In his waterpipe simile Ovid deliberately stressed the cultural discrepancy between narrative and image and deepened the contrast by introducing modern technology. From an intercultural perspective, modern technology and even natural science helped him to make his fiction as believable, as palpable as possible.[1]

4. Clash of Genres. *Gods and Religion in Ovid's* Metamorphoses[2] *with Special Regard to Venus and Elegy*

General Remarks: Gods and Some Crossings of Genres

There is perhaps no piece of Roman poetry which reflects more clearly the complexities of the Roman mind of the early imperial period than Ovid's *Metamorphoses.* Let us begin with some general remarks on gods, religion, and theology at that epoch. Under the heading "Gods" fall, for the most part, the deities of Greek myth. At first glance, since "myth" in the Roman period simply referred to a traditional story rendered in a literary form, it is tempting to subdivide the gods according to literary genres. Hence, we could distinguish Homeric gods from gods of tragedy, elegy and so on. In

[1] In this respect, the speech of Pythagoras in the last Book is not an unorganic addition, but it crowns the whole work by referring to established facts such as the metamorphosis of a butterfly and the birth of a bird from an egg. The last Book gives the most conclusive evidence for the validity of the principle of metamorphosis.

[2] The present chapter is dedicated to the memory of Henri Le Bonniec. It is based on my article "Les dieux et la religion dans les *Métamorphoses* d'Ovide", *Latomus* 201 (1988): 1-9. I have read the microfilm of and found surprisingly few points of contact with: W.C.Stephens, *The Function of Religious and Philosophical Ideas in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (diss. Princeton, 1957). The author concentrates mainly on the Orphic and Stoic aspects. Only a short chapter of his book is dedicated to some gods. The most important contribution to our subject in recent years is: D.C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* (Oxford, 1991). He shows how Ovid deviates from the standards of traditional epic: the principles of divine and human behaviour are no longer compatible. The initial parallel between Jupiter and Augustus seems to confirm the idea of compatibility; in the course of the poem, however, that idea is gradually undermined: Ovid's world with its incomprehensible and irresponsible gods becomes a *paysage démoralisé* (although some readers might feel that the behaviour of Homer's gods is not particularly moral either). Moreover, there are valuable discussions of Ovid's attitude to Augustus and to Roman religion and of allegorical figures. However, the role of mystery gods is outside the focus of Feeney's attention. Even after Feeney's book, the aspects discussed in the present paper—especially those related to the invention and overall structure of the *Metamorphoses*—might deserve some attention.

this context we will have to come back to Richard Heinze's[1] assertion that for Ovid the literary portrayal of gods was less a problem of religious belief than of literary style.

As far as the *Metamorphoses* are concerned, there are three aspects deserving our special attention, closely linked as they are with the subject of the *Metamorphoses* and its poetic character. First: gods causing metamorphoses (*Met.* 1. 2); second: gods inspiring poets (*Met.* 10. 148; 15. 622). In fact, the Muses only appear in the last books (V, X, XV) of each of the three main divisions of the work whereas in the beginning Ovid does not invoke "poetic" deities, but the gods who have caused metamorphoses and consequently are "experts" on these matters. Third, in the *Metamorphoses*, stories of love and, consequently, gods of love claim a place of honour.

To come to our second point, instead of defining religion (which is clearly beyond the scope of our short chapter), we will confine ourselves to stressing some aspects typical of Ovid's Roman public, such as the taste for ritual forms, the Roman *horror sacer*, the sense of *pietas*, but also the interest Ovid's contemporaries took in mystery religions.

Still smaller is the scope to which we will have to narrow down the notion of theology. Is there some theory of religion which could explain the strange shifts in Book 1 from a "physical" approach to a mythological one and in Book 15 vice versa? In this area, the Romans followed Varro's views, which have been handed down to us by St.Augustine in the 6th Book of his *De ciuitate dei.* In fact, Varro divided theology into three parts: first, *theologia ciuilis* as the religion of the State, primarily concerned with political life; second, *theologia fabulosa*, myth, which is the domain of poetry, especially tragedy; finally *theologia naturalis* or *rationalis*, which is based on philosophical thought. Different as they are, these three theologies coexist more or less peacefully in Ovid's work, but they are not mixed indiscriminately. Actually, the relative predominance or absence of one or two of them even seems to have some structural importance. In the account of the creation (Book 1), as well as in the speech of Pythagoras (Book 15), for example, a philosophical approach prevails. In

---

[1] R.Heinze, *Ovids elegische Erzählung* (Leipzig, 1919 = *SSAL* 71, 7): 1-130, esp. 1-19 and 102-106; repr. in: R.Heinze, *Vom Geist des Römertums* (Darmstadt, 3rd ed., 1960): 308-403, esp. 308-322 and 382-385. "Die Frage, wie diese mythische Götterwelt im Gedicht darzustellen sei, ist für ihn keine Glaubens-, sondern eine Stilfrage" (ibid. 11 = 315).

the greater part of the *Metamorphoses*, however, the view of the world is mythical, although, by way of puns and quasi-physical explanation of metamorphosis, some transparency is maintained throughout the work. Finally, there are allusions to the state religion, again especially in the first and in the last book. We observe, therefore, a tendency to include physical and political theology at the beginning and at the end of the work. But Varro does not answer all of our questions. In fact, it is one of the most striking paradoxes of ancient religious theory that the only gods who in our eyes might claim some religious importance are lacking in this list, the gods of mystery religions. Ovid is much more serious about them than about the Olympians; just think of Bacchus, Ceres, Isis (the role of the underworld in Books 5 and 10), and the prominence of Orpheus and Pythagoras in Books 10 and 15. Since mystery gods play a rather important role in the *Metamorphoses*, their omission is one of the most serious shortcomings of Varro's distinction, which in other respects is a rather useful clue to the *Metamorphoses*. Moreover, Varro's theory, at this point, fails to explain Ovid's historical approach which confronts the reader not only with a series of transformations caused by gods, but also with the appearance and succession of different gods (and deified sons of gods) in the course of history.

Before we pass to the main part of our study, let us consider briefly the literary aspects of gods in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. First of all, dismiss all hope of finding in the *Metamorphoses* any god exclusively and consistently typical of a single literary genre. To give an example, in the solemn assembly of gods (Book 1) Jupiter is provided with all of the features of the father of the gods known to us from ancient epic. By his majestic nodding he moves heaven, earth, and sea. No doubt Ovid is following the tradition of epic; but why is the wording (esp. *sidera*) reminiscent of Catullus 64. 204-206?! Likewise, on the occasion of the prodigies which occurred at Caesar's death, Ovid blends an imitation of Virgil's *Georgics* with very strong Tibullan reminiscences. Thus, even in non-elegiac matters, he sticks to the neoteric and elegiac tradition. Moreover, heroic aspects are mingled with strong touches of Roman realism: not only does Jupiter strangely resemble Augustus talking to a rather slavish Senate, but he is explicitly compared to him. Though the grandiosity of epic style is not completely destroyed by these elements, the reader feels that there is no single generic style which might explain the whole scale of colours and shades employed by Ovid. To give an example, in the love stories

which immediately follow the deluge, Jupiter reminds us of the supreme god as presented in comedies like Plautus' *Amphitruo* or Offenbach's operettas. The case of Jupiter clearly shows that Ovid's portrayal of gods cannot be traced back to one single generic source. It seems commendable, therefore, to approach the problem in a different way.

Roman pietas *and Roman Sense of Power*

Let us first dwell on some Roman aspects of Ovid's view of religion and religious behaviour and, second, consider in greater detail Ovid's use of the figures of Venus and Bacchus. Ovid evokes the Roman experience of *horror sacer* in the context of folklore. Two common people arriving at a sacred place, murmur one after another the formula "*faueas*". Ovid underlines the parallelism by repeating the same words (6. 327-328): "My guide stopped and, in a superstitious whisper, muttered: 'Oh, be gracious unto me!' I echoed his murmur, 'Be gracious!'"[1] *restitit et pauido 'faueas mihi' murmure dixit / dux meus, et simili 'faueas' ego murmure dixi.* This text graphically paints the simple mind of the speaker who doesn't know what is going on, but piously joins in his comrade's prayer. To our surprise, Franz Bömer,[2] though an expert on Roman religion, fails to comment on the Roman character of *horror sacer* in this passage and, instead, remarks on the open-air altars of almost forgotten deities, a rather unhelpful note in the context in question. Strangely enough, there is also something Roman to the voice heard by Cadmus after his victory over the dragon: the prophetic words from an unidentifiable source are reminiscent of the Roman god Aius Locutius.[3] Roman sense of *pietas* (filial affection) serves as a criterion in evaluating the behaviour of persons dazzled by a demon or a witch, such as the daughters of Pelias, who, on Medea's advice, kill their own father with the best intentions of rejuvenating him through magic. This paradoxical situation is explained in terms of *pietas.* We find the clue in Medea's own words (7. 336) "If you have any affection for him" *si pietas ulla est,* and in the comment on the reaction of the daughters (339-340):

---

[1] Translation: *The Metamorphoses of Ovid. Translated and with an Introduction by* M.M.Innes (Harmondsworth, 1955, many repr.): 143.

[2] P.Ovidius Naso, *Metamorphosen. Kommentar von* F.Bömer, Books 6-7 (Heidelberg, 1976): 96-97.

[3] Cf. Livy 5. 32. 6; 50. 5; K.Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Munich, 1960): 51.

"With such exhortations in their ears, Pelias' daughters performed the wicked deed, thinking they would be wicked not to do it: the more each loved her father, the quicker she was to hurt him" *his, ut quaeque pia est, hortatibus impia prima est / et, ne sit scelerata, facit scelus.* Medea is thinking of *pietas* as filial affection ("Do your duty by your father" *officium praestate patri* 7. 337); the connection between *officium* and *pietas* is duly stressed in Bömer's commentary, *ad loc.* Similarly in the story of Myrrha Ovid draws our attention to the problem of *pietas.* When asked by her father what sort of husband she would prefer Myrrha answers: "a man like you" (*similem tibi* 10. 364). He does not understand the incestuous double-sense and answers "*esto tam pia semper*" (which means in plain English "that's a good girl"). Ovid stresses the point by picking up the adjective *pia* and transforming it into a noun: "At the word 'devoted' the girl hung her head, conscious of her guilt" *pietatis nomine dicto / demisit uultus sceleris sibi conscia uirgo* (10. 366-367). As for *pietas* towards gods, men are rewarded for this sort of attitude in the tales of Pygmalion, Iphis, Philemon and Baucis. In such cases, *pietas* proves to be a way towards life, happiness and even deification, metamorphosis being regarded as a divine gift. Lastly, Ovid's insisting on the purity of heart gives his concept of *pietas* an almost philosophical touch.[1]

A typically Roman aspect of Ovid's attitude to the gods is the stress laid on their limitless power (8. 618-619 "The power of heaven is measureless and knows no bounds" *inmensa est finemque potentia caeli / non habet*) and on the efficacy of their will ("whatever the gods wish is at once achieved" *quidquid superi uoluere peractum est*). This holds true, however, only with two important reserves. First, as a rule, in the *Metamorphoses* gods are invoked not for their omnipotence but for their competence in some special field or case. Second, R.Heinze in his study of Ovid's elegiac narrative[2] overstated his case by maintaining that in the *Metamorphoses* the majesty of the gods is respected everywhere; it would have been more correct and more cautious to say that the majesty and power of the gods is a main issue and a main problem in the *Metamorphoses* (cf. 2. 846-847 "Majesty and love go ill together, nor can they long share one abode" *non bene conueniunt nec in una sede morantur / maiestas et amor*). Many a Roman reader might have been familiar with this problem.

---

[1] Cf. Lucretius 5. 1198-1203, and Seneca, *Frg.* 123 Haase.

[2] R.Heinze (quoted above, n. 3, p. 166).

Political Overtones

Ovid also proves to be a Roman by projecting on the Olympians the military, political, and legal attitudes typical of his nation: both gods and Romans are divided into patricians and plebeians; some inhabit the heavenly *palatium*, others the districts of Olympus City. In a more serious example of this literary technique, Jupiter presiding at the assembly of the gods is a true copy of Augustus in the Senate, and Ovid does not hesitate to make the parallel explicit (1. 200-206): "Their dismay was such as it was felt by the human race, when a wicked band of fanatics tried to extinguish the Roman name by shedding Caesar's blood: all men were seized by panic fear of instant destruction, and the whole world shuddered. Just as the loyal devotion of your subjects pleases you, Augustus, so did that of the gods please Jupiter. He checked their murmurs with a word, and as he raised his hand, all fell silent" *sic, cum manus inpia saeuit / sanguine Caesareo Romanum exstinguere nomen, / attonitum tanto subitae terrore ruinae / humanum genus est totusque perhorruit orbis; / nec tibi grata minus pietas, Auguste, tuorum est, / quam fuit illa Ioui. Qui postquam uoce manuque / murmura conpressit, tenuere silentia cuncti.* Ovid compares Lycaon's assault on Jupiter to an attempt on Augustus' life and imagines Jupiter no less flattered than Augustus by the pious indignation of their respective audience. Contrary to our modern taste, in the eyes of the Romans this comparison does not imply a debasement of the supreme god but an increase in historical reality. In fact, in the poetry of Ovid's exile, Augustus' power will be ranked above the power of mythical gods. To Ovid, Augustus is greater than his "father" Caesar, equally as Achilles surpasses Peleus, and Jupiter is superior to Saturn (15. 855-860).[1] This is in harmony with the stress Ovid generally lays on the sons of gods. The Romans, he occasionally says, do not need Apollo, but his son (15. 638-639) who comes *salutifer urbi* (15. 744) and *orbi* (2. 642), i.e. Aesculapius (perhaps Augustus, who was thought to be a son of Apollo, is also implied). Apotheoses of offsprings of gods play an important role in the penultimate books of each section: Ino (4), Hercules (9), Aeneas (14), Romulus, Hersilia. We will come back to the sons of gods, especially to those of Venus.

In this context, let us pay some attention to the final prayer of the

[1] "Caesar is a god because his adopted son made him one": Feeney (quoted above, n. 1, pp. 154-155: 211) does not exclude ironical undertones, especially in view of the expression *genuisse* (Ov., *Met.* 15. 819).

Metamorphoses which is a sort of public prayer for the Emperor. In this passage, which is one of Ovid's tributes to *theologia ciuilis,* he is following a poetic tradition known to us from Virgil's *Georgics* (1. 498-514). In Ovid's list of Roman gods the adjective *Caesareus* appears twice and thus attaches the gods to the person of the *princeps.* The invocation of the *penates* of Aeneas evokes the penultimate part of the work, the hero of which is Aeneas (13. 623-14. 608). Likewise, Mars and Quirinus recall the finale of Book 14 (805-851). Vesta, who is mentioned in the *Metamorphoses* only here, is closely related to Augustus. In fact, the *princeps* having become *pontifex maximus* in 12 B.C., was obliged to live near the temple of Vesta; and consecrated a chapel to Vesta in his palace on the Palatine (cf. *Fast.* 3. 415-428). Two other tutelary gods of his, Phoebus and Jupiter, hold a place of honour both in the final prayer and in the body of the *Metamorphoses* where they play an important role ever since the 1st book. As for Phoebus, he reestablishes the order of the world after the great flood through his victory over Python; later, he is connected with the foundation of Thebes through his oracle (3. 10-13),[1] he builds the walls of Troy (11. 204), and he is Augustus' tutelary god (15. 865; cf. 1. 562-563). Thus, he is related to three of the four great cities around which Ovid organizes his myths. Jupiter is called *pater et rector* in Books 9 and 15 (9. 245 and 15. 860) and is explicitly connected with Augustus in Books 1 (204) and 15 (858-860). Thus, in the final prayer, the names of gods recapitulate also some general aspects of the *Metamorphoses* by reflecting in the mirror of *theologia ciuilis* gods known to us from *theologia fabulosa.* An analogous principle can be found in Pythagoras' speech where Ovid, from a deliberately different point of view, refers to several facts mentioned in the mythological parts of his work: *theologia naturalis* "echoes" somehow a part of the message of *theologia fabulosa.*

Let us now turn to the role of individual gods. As for Venus,[2] her importance within the *Metamorphoses* does not seem to have been fully recognized.

---

[1] As a musician, he triumphs over Marsyas (6. 382-400) and over Pan (11. 165-179); unfortunately, he comes too late to help Orpheus (11. 58-60). As a doctor he fails in several cases: e.g. with his own love for Daphne (1. 521-524), with Coronis (2. 618), and with Hyacinthus (10. 189). The passages on Apollo have been collected and discussed by S.Lundström (*Ovids Metamorphosen und die Politik des Kaisers* [Uppsala, 1980]: 32-49), who, however, overstates Ovid's anti-Augustanism.

[2] W.C.Stephens, "Cupid and Venus in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*", *TAPhA* 89 (1958): 286-300.

Venus in the Metamorphoses

I: Books 1-5

In the *Metamorphoses* divinities of love play an important role. Long before Venus herself enters the stage, Cupid appears, and precisely at the very beginning of the mythic section proper. He is a wrathful god (1. 453). As *filius Veneris* (1. 463), acting, as it were, as a plenipotentiary of his divine mother, he proudly braves Phoebus' offensive and provocative speech. As early as Book 1, Cupid is shown to be superior to Apollo—and this in spite (or even because?) of Augustus' well-known connection with this god (cf. 1. 560-562). It is noteworthy that in the first love story within the *Metamorphoses* a divinity of love shows anger and exerts punishment. In the same story, Cupid, Venus, and Hymen are mentioned together as being neglected by Daphne (1. 480) while Phoebus, in his pursuit of her, is sped on by Cupid himself (1. 532 and 540).[1]

In the following series of stories (including Io, Syrinx, Phaethon, Callisto, Coronis, Aglauros, and Europa), Venus is conspicuously absent, though most of them are love stories. Jupiter falls in love with Io and with Callisto at first sight, as does Mercury with Herse. The onset of Apollo's love for Coronis is not described, and Jupiter's passion for Europa has already taken shape before the start of the narrative. In all of these cases the gods' wooing is crowned with success, whereas Daphne's rejection of Apollo needs supernatural motivation: no doubt for a god it is more honourable to have fallen victim to another god's wrath and not to a girl's caprice.

Venus is named again only in 3. 132 where, as in 1. 463, her name helps to enhance the dignity of another character. Rather unexpectedly, Mars and Venus act as the dignified parents-in-law of Cadmus. They are the divine protectors of Thebes, as they will be of Rome.

Completely different is the mention of Venus in the speech of Semele who asks Jupiter to embrace her as he does Juno when they conclude the pact of Venus (3. 282-285). This passage, which identifies Venus with her realm (cf. also 3. 323 and 4. 260), prepares Venus' first appearance on stage which we will discuss presently.

Surprisingly, in the Narcissus story the punishing goddess is not Venus but Nemesis (3. 406), and in the legend of Pyramus and

---

[1] In the two passages last quoted, Anderson (in his edition, Leipzig, 1977) writes *amor* with a small letter; nevertheless, he quotes these passages in his index of names *s.v. Amor.*

Thisbe there is no mention of Venus because love is motivated in terms of psychology.

By contrast, in the following narrative, the sun god's love is motivated by Venus' wrath. Venus and Mars[1] are mentioned together, as they had been in 3. 132, but, no longer dignified parents-in-law, they have turned back into young adulterers. In her first appearance as an acting character, Venus performs her proper function of goddess of sensual love, though, at the same time, she is a vengeful deity, as Cupid had been in 1. 463. By naming her after the place of her cult (3. 190), Ovid enhances her dignity.[2] The victim of both Venus' and Cupid's wrath is no lesser a god than Apollo. In 4. 190 *memorem poenam* recalls *memor ira* of Virgil's Juno (*Aen.* 1. 4); we will come back to this regal aspect of Ovid's Venus. The last story told by the daughters of Minyas is about Hermaphroditus, who is a son of Venus; in mistaking him for Cupid (3. 321), the nymph Salmacis is not too far from the truth. When granting her son's wish, Venus is pompously called *diva Cythereis* (4. 288).

We find an echo of Virgil's[3] kind and motherly Venus in her intercession on behalf of Ino (4. 531-538) and Caesar (15. 761-851). The fact that Venus is mentioned after the first and before the last Cadmus story and that she is named in the Semele and in the Tiresias episodes attests to her importance to the Cadmus section of the *Metamorphoses*. In Book 4, she is shown in three aspects, sensual love, the punishing queen, and the redeeming mother.[4]

Cupid and Venus, who have acted separately in Books 1 and 4, enter the stage together in Book 5. Solemnly introduced as Erycina, she directs a formal prayer to her son who, as in Book 1, is first addressed as *Cupido* (5. 366) and then as *Amor* (5. 374). The mention of the power of his weapons is reminiscent of 1. 463-465. The aim of Venus' speech is to extend her power, which already embraces heaven and earth, to the "third world", Hades. Her attack on Pluto is not an immediate act of revenge or punishment, although she tries to attribute a certain amount of guilt to some deities: is not Minerva's and Diana's virginity a provocation which begs for a preventive strike against Proserpina, who, as Venus cunningly supposes, seems to

---

1 Mars is the tutelary god of the serpent slain by Cadmus (3. 32); Pentheus appeals to Mars and to the snake (3. 531-550).

2 On the island of Cythera was the famous temple of Aphrodite Urania (Pausanias 3. 23. 1); for the myth, cf. Hesiod, *Theogony* 198.

3 A.Wlosok, *Die Göttin Venus in Vergils Aeneis* (Heidelberg, 1967).

4 Venus plays an important role in the Bacchus section of the *Metamorphoses*.

indulge in hopes of remaining a maiden? With the end of the first pentad of the *Metamorphoses*, the ultimate expansion of Venus' realm is completed. The goddess' universal power, thinly veiled behind a humble prayer, is exposed with imperious brevity at the end of her speech (5. 379): "'Unite in love that goddess with her uncle.' So she spoke."[1] *iunge deam patruo! dixit Venus.* After a long oration this abrupt ending and the baldness of *dixit Venus* conspire to produce an effect of energy.[2]

II: Books 5-10

After this manifestation of her power, Venus is not mentioned again for a long time. To fall in love with Arethusa, Alpheus needs no divine interference; Tereus, in his barbaric passion, is alien to Venus; nor does the North Wind need divine help to rape Orithyia. Ovid's Medea, unlike Apollonius', is not struck by Cupid's arrow; instead, she feels that "the greatest god reigns in her heart" (7. 55). This shift reflects an attitude of the Romans, who laid greater stress on the power of their gods than on their visual appearance. Generally, in Books 6-8 the tragedy of passion is described in human terms.

With book 9, however, the pattern seems to change. Among a series of gods Venus appears (9. 424-425) asking Jupiter to rejuvenate Anchises, a passage comparable in function to 5. 331. The first mortal to invoke Venus and Cupid by name (9. 482) is Byblis, who, as the context makes clear, relates Venus to sensuous love (cf. also 9. 553: "Love that heeds no rules suits our young years" *conueniens annis Venus*[3] *est temeraria nostris*). Byblis feels that she has been overwhelmed by a great god, not by mere lust (9. 543-545; 9. 624-625), and, like a Mænad (9. 641-644), is obsessed with the god. A mention of Venus and her son Hymenaeus (9. 796) at the end of Book 9 announces the leading role of Venus in the following book.[4] While Venus in the first and in the last third of the *Metamorphoses* is associated with Bacchus, here, in the central part, she cooperates with Isis.

In Book 5 Cupid's arrow had made Pluto fall in love with Proserpina, a fact expressly referred to by Orpheus (10. 25-29): "My heart

[1] Translation: A.D.Melville (Oxford, 1986; paperback: Oxford, 1987).

[2] The metamorphosis of Venus into a fish (5. 331; cf. 4. 45 *Derceti*), is part of a series of theriomorphic transformations of gods, partly implying some degradation.

[3] One might consider writing *uenus* here, but *Venus* is invoked elsewhere by Byblis, who explicitly states that her passion is not mere *libido* but divine obsession.

[4] As he had been at Iphis' marriage at the end of Book 9, Hymenaeus is present at Orpheus' marriage (10. 1-7), but without bringing luck.

has sought strength to endure; the attempt I'll not deny; but Love has won, a god whose fame is fair in the world above; but here I doubt, though here, too, I surmise; and if that ancient tale of ravishment is true, you too were joined in Love." *Posse pati uolui nec me temptasse negabo: / uicit Amor.*[1] *supera deus hic bene notus in ora est. / An sit et hic, dubito; sed et hic tamen auguror esse, / famaque si ueteris non est mentita rapinae, / uos quoque iunxit Amor.*[2] The fact that Orpheus is overwhelmed by love makes him forget the condition, and he looks back at Eurydice (10. 57 "He turned his eyes, full of love" *flexit amans oculos*). Having lost his wife, Orpheus then avoids the love of women (*feminea Venus* 10. 80) and discovers pederasty, a theme treated in connection with Phoebus[3] and Jupiter,[4] who had also been the amatory protagonist in Book 1. From this point on, Venus becomes the central figure and is seen mostly as an avenging deity: she punishes the Cerastae for ritual murder of foreigners; the punishment of Proetus' daughters, who refuse to acknowledge Venus as a goddess, is prostitution, the inability to blush, and finally petrification. Here, for the first time, Venus immediately causes metamorphosis. Yet, just as disregard of her divinity brings death, so is her worship a source of life. Thus, entreated by Pygmalion, she brings his statue to life and even endows the new maiden with fertility. A contrasting example is Hippomenes. Venus helps him in his wooing of Atalanta, but he forgets to thank the goddess. To punish him, she induces the impatient lovers to desecrate a temple of the mother of the gods (10. 689-690), who turns them into lions. At the end of the second pentad, Venus also changes Adonis into a flower.

The Myrrha myth is genealogically inserted into this group of metamorphoses connected with Venus. Myrrha is the great-granddaughter of Pygmalion and his statue. Myrrha's fatal falling in love with her father is prefigured, and almost predestined, in the story of Pygmalion who is the "father" and the husband of the ivory maiden.[5] Moreover, Myrrha, being the mother of Adonis, is the essential link to the next myth in which Venus falls in love with Adonis because her

---

1 The capital letter is required by the context (*hic deus*).

2 The allusion to Book 5, with the detailed introduction of Cupid shooting, shows that *Amor* is a proper noun.

3 Cyparissus, Hyacinthus.

4 Ganymede.

5 In the Myrrha myth Venus is in conflict with *pietas* (3. 24). Cupid declines any responsibility for Myrrha's sinful love (3. 11), which has been caused by one of the Furies (3. 14).

son inadvertently scratched her with one of his arrows. The goddess, though recently shown at the peak of her power, is now hopelessly doomed in her own love affair. In Book 1 Cupid hurts Apollo, in Book 5 Pluto, in Book 10 Venus herself.

III: Books 11-15

At the beginning of the last third of the *Metamorphoses* Venus is once again eclipsed, just as she had been at the beginning of the second pentad. In Book 11 she serves only as a metaphor for lust.[1] The love of Ceyx and Alcyone, who are married, is not Venus' but Juno's province (11. 578). Neither does Venus interfere with Peleus and Thetis nor get involved when the two gods visit Chione. It is less surprising that the gods of love are absent from the Trojan War.[2]

One could say, however, that Ovid's "Aeneid" is a section dominated by Venus. It is framed by the key-words *Cythereius heros* (13. 625; 14. 584). The first third of the work had been framed by another son of Venus (1. 463 *filius Veneris*: 5. 365 *mea, nate, potentia*), Cupid. We showed elsewhere[3] that the story of Anius' daughters associates Venus with Bacchus[4] and Apollo.[5] This combination reminds us of the first pentad.[6] The section devoted to Venus is appropriately introduced by the ætiology of her sacred birds, the doves.[7]

The story of the Cyclops serves to document the power of Venus: "Oh, how powerful, kind Venus, is thy reign!" *pro! quanta potentia regni / est Venus alma tui* (13. 758-759).[8] Circe's unbridled passion (14. 27) is due to Venus' revenge for Sol's treachery (cf. 4. 190): Ovid himself stresses this parallel between the first and the last third of the *Metamorphoses*. The story of the Sibyl strangely resembles the Daphne myth, for Apollo again is an unsuccessful lover. The Sibyl gets only

---

1 11. 306; cf. 12. 198.

2 Note the description of catastrophes in the second books of each pentad: conflagration (Book 2), the plague (Book 7), the Trojan War (Book 12). Aurora's petition to Jupiter as an epic "set-piece" preludes Ovid's "Aeneid".

3 See here, pp. 199-200.

4 The metaphorical mention of Ceres and Bacchus (13. 639) sets up the future role of Bacchus and points back to the Ceres myth in Book 5.

5 Usually Apollo is not particularly helpful, cf. his wait-and-see attitude in the cases of Andros and Orpheus as compared to Bacchus' active intercession. Consider also Apollo's helplessness in the cases of Coronis, Cyparissus, and Hyacinthus; his son Aesculapius, however, is a great helper (cf. 15. 433).

6 There is interaction between Venus, Cupid, and Apollo (*Sol*), and there are family ties with Bacchus.

7 For a condamnation of brutal political power, cf. the Pyreneus myth in Book 5.

8 The Cyclops mentions *ueneris concordia* of Acis and Galatea (13. 875).

what she had asked for, long life without eternal youth. She rejects Apollo's love (*Venerem*: 14. 141). Venus' curse impairs Circe's love for Picus, who shuns *Venus externa* (14. 380). Quite personal is Venus' hatred of Diomedes, who had wounded her during the Trojan War (14. 477): "Gentle Venus, remembering the wound I had once dealt her, exacted punishment from me"[1] *at antiquo memores de uulnere poenas / exigit alma Venus*. Evidently Venus is styled as a new Juno (cf. *Aeneid* 1. 4 *saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram*). The wording also recalls a passage from the first third of the *Metamorphoses* (4. 190): "Venus did not forget. Him who revealed and brought to ruin the love she hoped to hide she punished with a love as ruinous" *exigit (!) indicii memorem (!) Cythereia poenam (!)*, cf. also 14. 494 *iratam Venerem*.

Consequently, Aeneas' victory over Turnus is seen through the eyes of Venus: *tandemque Venus uictricia nati / arma uidet* (14. 572-573). The purification preparing Aeneas' apotheosis is executed by a river at Venus' command. This collaboration of Venus and water deities is reminiscent of Ino's apotheosis (4. 531-542).

Pomona's coyness is finally converted to love; initially we are told: "Venus had no attraction for her"[2] *ueneris quoque nulla cupido est* (14. 634). The menace of divine wrath and nemesis[3] is reminiscent of the Narcissus story to which the Pomona myth is a positive counterpart. The myth of Anaxarete is an ætiological legend from Cyprus which explains the statue and the temple of *Venus prospiciens* (14. 759-761). The whole of the Vertumnus section is an aretalogy of Venus. There follows a legend of a miracle wrought by Venus: using her well-known influence on water deities, she helps the Romans against the Sabines. At the side of Mars, who brings about the apotheosis of Romulus, there is Venus as another tutelary goddess of the Romans. Likewise, in Books 3-4 Mars and Venus had acted as the protectors of Thebes (3. 132; cf. 4. 171-189).[4]

In the final books of each pentad problems of occult knowledge and revelation are touched upon. Numa, who is taught by Pythagoras, is a positive counterpart to Midas who is initiated by Orpheus. The mysteries of Ceres (Book 5) are complemented by Orphic (Book 10)

---

[1] Translation: M.M.Innes (Harmondsworth, 1955; repr. 1978).

[2] Translation: see preceding note.

[3] 14. 694, cf. 3. 406: these are the only instances for *Rhamnusis* and *Rhamnusia* in the *Metamorphoses*.

[4] With Pentheus (3. 531-733), the devotion to Mars becomes fatally one-sided. The stories within the story exhibit an analogous tendency: both Narcissus and Anaxarete despise love.

and Pythagorean revelation (Book 15).[1] The Venus theme develops differently. In Book 5 her realm is extended to the netherworld. In Book 10 Orpheus tries to conquer death by his love, but he fails, because of his love. His song enhances Venus' power over others, but also shows her helplessness as far as her own love is concerned.[2] In the last book, however, she is victorious: as she had deified Ino in the first third of the *Metamorphoses*, she now changes her progeny Caesar[3] into a god.

An Interim Balance

Venus plays an important role in Books 4-5, 10, and 14-15. Together with the presence of the Muses,[4] of mysterious revelation, and of episodes of more than four hundred lines in Books 5, 10, and 15, the theme of Venus converges to stress the pentadic structure of the *Metamorphoses*, which seems to be implied in the poet's reference to his work as *ter quinque uolumina* (*Trist.* 1. 1. 117; 3. 14. 9). The association of Venus with other gods also seems to stress this overall structure: in the first and third pentads Venus and Mars protect Thebes and Rome whereas the central section (Books 6-10) is focused upon Athens. This tripartite structure of the work is alluded to in the Pythagoras speech (15. 429-431): "What but a name is Oedipus' city, Thebes? What remains of Pandion's Athens but a name? Even today, rumour has it that a Trojan city, Rome, is rising." *Oedipodioniae quid sunt nisi nomina Thebae, / quid Pandioniae restant nisi nomen Athenae? / Nunc quoque Dardaniam fama est consurgere Romam.* The names of the cities around which the three sections of the *Metamorphoses* are centered, are placed at the ends of successive lines. In the first third,

---

[1] Pythagoras is the Hyperborean Apollo (cf. 15. 144).

[2] Prepared by her vain plea for the rejuvenation of Anchises (cf. 15. 144).

[3] Hercules (cf. Book 9) could have been a ready *figura* for Caesar; Ovid does not detract from Hercules' and Bacchus' authority and avoids the beaten paths of Augustan panegyric. D.C.Feeney, *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford, 1991): 207-213, observed that Ovid portrays Venus as a mother acting in the personal interest of her son whereas in the *Aeneid* she sides with the Roman people as a whole. It is true that, in Ovid's time, monarchy has become more evident, but in Virgil, too, Venus acts as a loving mother (and even grandmother).

[4] For the pentadic structure of the *Metamorphoses*, recently E.Rieks, "Zum Aufbau von Ovids Metamorphosen", *WJA*, n.s. 6 B (1980): 85-103; A.Bartenbach, *Motiv- und Erzählstruktur in Ovids Metamorphosen. Das Verhältnis von Rahmen- und Binnenerzählungen im 5., 10. und 15. Buch von Ovids Metamorphosen* (Frankfurt, 1990 = *Studien zur Klassischen Philologie* 52).

Venus is combined with Apollo, Bacchus, Neptune, and Pluto; in the second with Isis, Adonis, Apollo, and Bacchus; in the third section, with Apollo, Bacchus, and Jupiter.

Venus' descendants play an important role throughout the *Metamorphoses*. In Books 1-5 Cupid establishes her power over the three regions of the world. Another central figure of the first section, Bacchus, is also a descendant of Venus. In the second third of the *Metamorphoses*, Venus' son Hymenaeus serves as an important link. In the last third, her human son Aeneas is a central character, whose apotheosis, it should be noted, recalls Ino's in the first third.

Is there a development in the character of Venus? Having stayed in the background as an important figure (Book 1), in Book 4 she reveals herself in three aspects, as the goddess of lust (with Mars: 4. 171-189), as an avenging deity (with Phoebus: 4. 190-192), and as a caring mother (with Ino: 4. 531-542). Book 4 prefigures the tripartite function of Venus in Book 14 and is even directly referred to at 14. 27. At the end of Book 5, Venus has extended her power over all of the universe. In the first third she talks to Neptune and defeats Pluto; in the last third she talks to Jupiter. The central section shows Venus as a goddess producing metamorphoses and as the victim of unhappy love while her ability to change men into gods is stressed in the final section. The straightforward eroticism of her first appearance (Book 4) is not repeated; her love for Adonis (Book 10) is so touching because it is protective yet unable to protect him; in the last section Venus is solemnly addressed as Anchises' *coniunx*. And although she behaves with Aeneas and Caesar in a purely maternal way, on the level of vocabulary at least, the identification of Venus with *uoluptas* is maintained throughout.

Ovid's Elegiac Roots

What are the roots of Ovid's representation of Venus? For the erotic aspect, the author of the *Amores* and the *Ars Amatoria* did not have to look to external sources. His vengeful Venus, though partly recalling Virgil's Juno, bears an intriguing resemblance to Nemesis (Rhamnusia); and this points to Tibullus, a poet deeply admired by Ovid, though not always sufficiently accounted for by Ovid's critics. To be sure, the rash and vindictive Venus is part of the inventory of Roman love elegy, a genre to which Ovid remained faithful in more than one respect.

Virgil's maternal Venus is not crucial to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, though Ovid cannot omit this aspect in connection with Ino, Aeneas, and Caesar. Ovid's Venus, however, is more vindictive and more conscious of her power than Virgil's. Nor does the playful poet resist the temptation to add some slightly comical touches to Venus' persistent sollicitations of the gods out of her concern for Caesar; yet these burlesque elements of Book 4 do not reappear; the feeling is genuine. The parallel between Venus' concern for Adonis (Book 10) and Caesar (15) are intentional (by the way, the most gripping passages in the Caesar section are, again, inspired by Tibullus). A study of the function of Venus in the *Metamorphoses* seems to contribute to a better understanding of the last section of the work and its relation to the first and the second pentads. In addition, it shows that more attention needs to be paid to Ovid's own hints as to the tripartite structure of the *Metamorphoses* as a whole. Finally, it attests to the importance of Latin love elegy, in general, and of Tibullus, in particular, to the invention of the *Metamorphoses.*

In sum, the power of Cupid and Venus is at stake in Books 1 (1. 463-465) and 5 (5. 365-379). In Book 10, Cupid conquers Orpheus (26), and, through him, Proserpina for the second time (46, cf. 29). In the same book, Cupid wounds Venus herself. In the first third of the work, Venus causes the apotheosis of Ino (4. 531-542), in the last third she deifies Aeneas (14. 581-608) and Caesar (15. 745-851); this episode, which is the last metamorphosis, forms an effective contrast to Venus' grief for Adonis at the end of the second third of the *Metamorphoses* (Book 10). As for the religious aspects of Venus, in Ovid, she is a mighty and vindictive goddess, not unlike Tibullus' Venus and often rather different from the motherly and gracious Venus known to us from Virgil. With her sense of power, she is not only more "elegiac", but also more "Roman" than her Virgilian model.

A Parallel Case: Bacchus

Let us now come to Bacchus, whose role in the *Metamorphoses* seems to deserve more attention than has hitherto been paid.[1] In fact, this god, whose cult had been persecuted in Rome for a long time, holds a place of honour in the *Metamorphoses.*[2] In Books 3 and 4, Bacchus is very prominent, and in Books 11 and 13 he comes back at crucial

---

1 This is true even of D.C.Feeney's excellent book (quoted above, n. 1, pp. 154-155).

2 Cf. C.Klemm, *Bacchus in den Metamorphosen Ovids* (Zul.-Arb. Heidelberg, 1983).

points, specifically before and after the "Trojan" section of the *Metamorphoses*. Moreover, Bacchus is closely attached to Thebes, his birthplace, the tutelary gods of which are Mars and Venus, who are also the protectors of Rome.[1]

Like Caesar, he is an offspring of Venus, born in a city which is protected by Mars and Venus. Ovid loves to stress the importance of Venus' sons throughout his work, from Cupid to Caesar.[2] In fact, in the first third of the work, it is Venus' son Cupid, whose worldwide power is at stake (Books 1 and 5), and another of her offsprings, Bacchus, who keeps a place of honour; in the last third it is another son of Venus', Aeneas, who founds the Roman Empire. Thus, the parallelism of mythical and historical events, as well as of Thebes and Rome, is supported by the use of names of gods, genealogy and the role of Venus and Bacchus.

In this context, some words on the connection between Bacchic *furor* and the pathos of love, which is a main theme in the *Metamorphoses*, may be useful. Bacchus is a "new" god, and the conservative king Pentheus refuses to accept him in the community of his πόλις. Bacchic madness serves to punish him. Several forms of this *furor* can be observed: first, the real "Bacchic" *furor* of Pentheus' mother Agave, who kills her own son; second, Ino's madness which actually has been caused by Juno, whereas her dazzled victim invokes Bacchus,—we might call this a case of "subjective" Bacchic madness—; third, the feigned Bacchic *furor* of Progne,[3] who adopts this behaviour on purpose in order to rescue and avenge her sister Philomela. Step by step the emotional disturbance descends from a divine to a merely human level (if the barbarity raging in the Progne-story still deserves to be called human), and finally degenerates into the destruction of Orpheus through the Mænads.

As for Bacchus himself, he develops from an avenging god into a saviour; in the later books, he even punishes his own Mænads for

---

[1] Cf. 3. 131-132, cf. 14. 805-828 Mars and 14. 581-608 Venus.

[2] Feeney (quoted above, n.1, pp. 154-155: 212-214) rightly observes that Ovid's Venus when deifying her descendants sympathizes rather with individual persons than with the Roman people as such. However, even Virgil does not disdain such personal touches (Venus appears in the *Aeneid* as a caring mother and even grandmother). Ovid's attitude in this respect is not only conditioned by his all-too human view of the gods; it is also a corollary to the evolution of the Roman republic toward monarchy: in monarchic societies the *pietas erga patriam* evidently tends to be personalized (*pietas erga regem*). Of course, this does not necessarily impair patriotism; it might even enhance it.

[3] This seems to have been Ovid's spelling (following Latin, not Greek usage).

having murdered Orpheus and helps Midas as well as the daughters of Anius. To our surprise Orpheus is connected with Bacchus, even though Orpheus, being a son of Calliope, belongs to the circle of Apollo. But there are more points of contact between Bacchus and Apollo than are dreamt of in Nietzsche's philosophy (this is true even of the *Metamorphoses*, where both gods cooperate not only in the Orpheus, but also in the Anius myth and thus help to frame the Trojan legend). Moreover, as can be seen from the poetry of Ovid's exile, Ovid and his fellow poets paid special respect to Bacchus, holding him in veneration as a deity inspiring poets. The parallel drawn in the *Metamorphoses* between Bacchus and Caesar, both descendants of Venus, unfortunately, did not hold good, as far as Ovid's own fate was concerned: it is true that Bacchus did justice to Orpheus, but it is equally true that Augustus did not to Ovid.

In the maze of the *Metamorphoses* Bacchus appears under several different aspects. As a great-grandson of Mars and Venus, he forms a parallel to Caesar, a fact which is underlined by the identification of both gods as tutelary divinities of Thebes and Rome. On the other hand, Bacchus is a god of mysteries and of poetry; his scope, therefore, transcends that of a political godhead. Treating gods of mysteries like Bacchus and Isis with much more respect than the Olympians, Ovid not only took into account the religious feelings of his readers, devoted as they were to those foreign cults which were partly persecuted by the government. Still more, Ovid's use of the figure of Bacchus results from his conviction that there is something like a creative genius and that love of poetry can become a firm link between persons and make them members of a community.

Conclusion

It now appears that a study of Ovid's manner of dealing with the gods is more than just a problem of style. It even could shed some light on the structure of the work which is otherwise so difficult to grasp, it could help us understand Ovid's view of myth and history, and, last but not least, of those factors in human life which were most important to him, love, art and poetic genius. In Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, elements of Greek myth, Roman religious feeling, literary and philosophical tradition, and even theology, are combined not into a philosophical system, but into a body of poetic signs which, transcending their traditional level of meaning, point to the centre of Ovid's poetic invention.

Epilogue: In Ovid's portrayal of the gods, rhetoric plays an important role, as his use of allegorical figures and his descriptions, in particular, demonstrate. But, in Ovid's case, rhetoric did not impair the poet's talent; rather, it lent him wings. (The same had happened as early as in the *Amores*, where he gave up Tibullus' polyphony and concentrated on a systematic elaboration of one or two themes in each poem). The rhetorical aspects of Ovid's dialogue with his reader are discussed in a separate chapter (see pp. 143-153). All these rhetorical devices served him to give the *Metamorphoses* a personal touch.

As for intertextual relationships (in the narrower sense of the word), in the *Metamorphoses* we have seen that Ovid uses Tibullus even in a serious political context when talking of the *omina* at Caesar's death. This may be a sort of hidden protestation; it reminds us of Aeneas quoting Callimachus (Catullus) to Dido. What a shame that the quotation was wasted on the prehistoric queen! Such quotations or allusions give the text a double resonance, for they allow us to hear some private voice under the surface of the poet's public voice.

On a more abstract level, the categories "crossing of genres" (Kroll), or "inclusion of genres" (Cairns) are especially fruitful for understanding the *Metamorphoses*. In fact, the overlapping of "epic" and "elegiac" elements is one of the ways in which Ovid gives inner life to an otherwise conventional genre. R.Heinze[1] had stated with great confidence that the *Metamorphoses* follow the rules of epic, whereas H.Tränkle[2] correctly uncovered traces of the elegiac genre in the work. That there is a great number of them could be easily shown by listing all of the reminiscences of Tibullus, which, however, would be too long a task.[3] Many details, apparently epic in style, come from

---

1 See above n. 3, p. 166.

2 "Elegisches in Ovids Metamorphosen", *Hermes* 91 (1963): 459-476.

3 Some noteworthy reminiscences: the description of the Golden Age (*Met.* 1. 89-112) is tinged with Tibullan colours (1. 3. 35-90; 1. 10. 9-10), as is the incurable, amorous passion of Apollo (*Met.* 1. 452-453; Tib. 2. 3. 11-32; cf. esp. *Met.* 1. 523; Tib. 2. 3. 13-14; 1. 5. 43-44; 1. 2. 59-62; this bucolic theme is related to Phoebus by Tibullus and by Ovid); Ceyx' taste for peace (*Met.* 11. 297, where the polyptoton *pax - pacis* perhaps comes from Tibullus, cf. Tib. 1. 10. 45-50, where the word *pax* occurs three times and is followed by the ablative *pace*); Glaucus' supplication of Circe (*Nec medeare mihi sanesque haec uulnera mando / fineque nil opus est; partem ferat illa caloris*, *Met.* 14. 23-24; cf. *non ego totus abesset amor sed mutuus esset / orabam*, Tib. 1. 2. 63-64); Iphis, the spurned lover (*Met.* 14. 698-764; Tib. 1. 2); Thetis, on a bridled dolphin, coming to see Peleus (*Met.* 11. 236-237; Tib. 1. 6. 45-46); Isis piously honoured at the side of Osiris (*Met.* 9. 686-703; cf. Tib. 1. 3. 23-24; 1. 7. 21-54).

elegy. The vengeful Venus depicted at different points in the *Metamorphoses*,[1] an image created by Tibullus, differs greatly from Virgil's maternal Venus; the prodigies which mark the death of Caesar (*Met.* 15. 782-798; Tib. 2. 5. 71-78) and Ovid's summary of the *Aeneid* recall Tibullan brevity.[2] In the *Metamorphoses*, then, gods and men are described in the manner of the elegiac poets, often in the very phrases of Tibullus. The Tibullan impact makes itself felt even in the treatment of Rome and Caesar; probably Ovid when treating these subjects, which were rather far away from his personal tastes, drew some secret consolation from imitating Tibullus even here. Further research on the Tibullan influence on the *Metamorphoses* might be promising.

Ovid does not separate the genres of elegy and epic, but rather establishes points of contact between them and has them enrich each other.

Let us finally turn to the intercultural level. We have seen how ancient Roman categories interfere with an utterly anthropomorphic, even secularized view of the gods. Actually, Venus becomes more "believable" as a poetic figure if depicted as a caring Roman mother. Ovid's Roman "realism" in his portrayal of gods is certainly most enjoyable, but it cannot be reduced to "parody" or "travesty" in the style of Offenbach. Nor is it fully explicable in terms of rhetorical *euidentia* carried to an extreme. Rather, we should consider it a typically Roman attempt to give myth poetic reality by placing myth within the context of people like you and me. Ovid's intercultural assimilation and new establishment of myth is, ultimately, not very far away from Virgil's: both poets refer to Roman life to confirm their poetic fiction by reality, though Ovid's perspective is less focused on political history. The same is true of the importance of nature to man both in the *Georgics* and the *Metamorphoses*.

---

[1] Venus angry or vengeful: Tib. 1. 2. 4 (cf. *Met.* 1. 162); 81. 92. 99; 1. 3. 79; 1. 5. 57; 1. 8. 28; 1. 9. 20; *Met.* 10. 68-69 (Hippomenes punished); 10. 228 (Cerastae); 10. 238-239 (Propoetides); 14. 411-412; 499-500 (Diomedes and his companions); 4. 190-191 (the sun); 14. 27 (Circe); cf. the wrath of Cupid (1. 453).

[2] *Met.* 13. 623-14. 608; cf. expecially Tib. 2. 5. 39-50 and Ovid 14. 75-81; 441-453; 527-531; 561-574.

5. *Clash of Systems of Values.* The Daughters of Anius (*Ovid,* Metamorphoses *13. 623-674*)

Non tamen euersam Troiae cum moenibus esse
spem quoque fata sinunt; sacra et, sacra altera, patrem
fert umeris, uenerabile onus, Cythereïus heros.
de tantis opibus praedam pius eligit illam
Ascaniumque suum profugaque per aequora classe
fertur ab Antandro scelerataque limina Thracum
et Polydoreo manantem sanguine terram
linquit et utilibus uentis aestuque secundo
intrat Apollineam sociis comitantibus urbem.
hunc Anius, quo rege homines, antistite Phoebus
rite colebatur, temploque domoque recepit
urbemque ostendit delubraque nota duasque
Latona quondam stirpes pariente retentas;
ture dato flammis uinoque in tura profuso
caesarumque boum fibris de more crematis
regia tecta petunt positisque tapetibus altis
munera cum liquido capiunt Cerealia Baccho.
tum pius Anchises: 'o Phoebi lecte sacerdos,
fallor, an et natum, cum primum haec moenia uidi,
bisque duas natas, quantum reminiscor, habebas?'
huic Anius niueis circumdata tempora uittis
concutiens et tristis ait: 'non falleris, heros
maxime; uidisti natorum quinque parentem,
quem nunc (tanta homines rerum inconstantia uersat)
paene uides orbum. quod enim mihi filius absens
auxilium, quem dicta suo de nomine tellus
Andros habet, pro patre locumque et regna tenentem?
Delius augurium dedit huic, dedit altera Liber
femineae stirpi uoto maiora fideque
munera. nam tactu natarum cuncta mearum
in segetem laticemque meri canaeque Mineruae
transformabantur, diuesque erat usus in illis.
hoc ubi cognouit Troiae populator Atrides,
ne non ex aliqua uestram sensisse procellam
nos quoque parte putes, armorum uiribus usus
abstrahit inuitas gremio genitoris alantque
imperat Argolicam caelesti munere classem.
effugiunt, quo quaeque potest: Euboea duabus,
et totidem natis Andros fraterna petita est;
miles adest et, ni dedantur, bella minatur.
uicta metu pietas: consortia corpora poenae
dedidit, et timido possis ignoscere fratri:
non hic Aeneas, non, qui defenderet Andron,
Hector erat, per quem decimum durastis in annum.
iamque parabantur captiuis uincla lacertis;

illae tollentes etiamnum libera caelo
bracchia 'Bacche pater, fer opem!' dixere, tulitque
muneris auctor opem, si miro perdere more
ferre uocatur opem! nec qua ratione figuram
perdiderint, potui scire aut nunc dicere possum.
summa mali nota est: pennas sumpsere tuaeque
coniugis in uolucres, niueas abiere columbas.'

However,[1] the fates did not allow Troy's hopes to be utterly overthrown, together with her walls. The hero Aeneas, the son of Venus, carried away upon his shoulders the city's sacred images, and with them another burden, (625) equally sacred, his venerable father. Out of all his great possessions, the good Aeneas chose to bear away this portion, and his son Ascanius. Setting out from Antandros, he was borne across the sea, in his fugitive ships, leaving behind him the guilt-stained homes of Thrace, the land reeking with Polydorus' blood. (630) He sailed before prosperous winds and a following tide, till he came with his friends to Delos, and the city of Apollo. There Anius was king and priest in one, serving his people and Apollo with the same devotion. He received Aeneas into his home and temple, and showed him the city, the famous shrine, (635) and the two trees to which Latona had once clung, when she was giving birth to her children. The Trojans sprinkled incense in the flames, and poured wine upon the incense. When the entrails of slain oxen had been duly burned, they made their way to the palace. Lofty couches were set out, and the visitors took a meal of bread, the gift of Ceres, washed down with draughts of wine. (640) Then goodly Anchises addressed his host, and said: 'Chosen priest of Phoebus, am I mistaken, or did you have a son, when I first saw those city walls, and four daughters too, if I remember aright?' Shaking his head, which was encircled with snowy fillets, sadly Anius replied: 'Great hero, you are not mistaken. (645) You saw me then, the parent of five children. But now, so fickle is human fortune, you see me practically childless. For of what use to me is my absent son, who lives and rules in his father's stead in the land which is called Andros, after him? (650) The Delian god, Apollo, gave my son the power to foretell the future, and to my daughters Bacchus gave other gifts, beyond anything for which they had hoped or prayed. All that they touched was changed into corn, or into streams of wine or olive oil, so that there was rich profit in the girls. (655) But when the man who plundered your city, Agamemnon son of Atreus, heard of this marvel, he used armed force to drag my children from their father's breast, against their will. So, you see, we too, to some extent, felt the hurricane of disaster that overwhelmed you. He ordered the girls to feed the Greek fleet, by means of their heaven-sent gift, (660) but each of them fled for refuge where she could: two made for Euboea, and two for their brother's kingdom of Andros. Up came the army, and threatened war, unless they were handed over. The king's affection for his sisters was overcome by fear, and he surrendered them to their doom. One can forgive the faint-hearted brother: (665) there was no Aeneas there, to defend Andros, no Hector, thanks to whom you Trojans endured till the tenth year of the war. Fetters were

[1] Translation: M.M.Innes (Harmondsworth, 1955, repr. 1978).

already being prepared for the arms of the captives, but while those arms yet were free, the girls raised them up to heaven, and cried to their patron god: 'Father Bacchus, lend us your aid!' (670) The god who had given them their gift brought them his help, if it can be called helping to bring about their miraculous destruction. How they lost their human shape I could not discover, nor can I tell you now, but I do know the final issue of this calamity. My daughters took wings, and were changed into snowy doves, the birds that belong to Venus, your wife.'

The following analysis of narrative devices is a preparatory inquiry into "textual syntax", a method of literary criticism which applies principles of both syntax and narrative theory. Special attention will be paid to the communication between narrator and reader and to the position of our text in the whole of the *Metamorphoses*.

The Larger Context: Venus and Apollo

Our text is preceded by the myth of Memnon which concludes the Trojan section of the *Metamorphoses*, a section framed by the name of Troy (11. 199 Troy founded, and 13. 623 Troy ultimately not destroyed). In the next main section, hope and expectation for the new Troy, Rome, will be the leading motif. Tellingly, the protagonist of this section, Aeneas, is introduced as "Cytherea's hero" *Cythereius heros* (13. 625). Since the relevance of names in the *Metamorphoses* goes beyond the level of mere stylistic variation, one must assume at this point that *Cytherea*, that is to say Venus, will play an important role (actually, several different roles) in Ovid's "Aeneid", as indeed she does. In the myth of the Cyclops, Venus is the goddess of love and is apostrophized in this role (13. 758-759). The same is true of the story of Vertumnus and Pomona. What is more important: Venus acts as an avenging deity in the metamorphosis of Diomedes' companions (14. 478; 487; 494); likewise, in the Circe tale, Ovid takes into consideration an act of vengeance on the part of Venus, and in so doing refers back to Book 4 (14. 27; cf. 4. 171-192). In the Tarpeia legend, however, Venus appears as the tutelary goddess of the Romans (14. 783), and finally, in the apotheosis of Aeneas she plays the role of a mother (14. 581-608). Meaningfully here the title *Cythereius heros* (14. 584) reappears; we have thus come full circle (cf. 13. 625 above). After this, Venus will only come back to change Caesar into a comet (15. 760-851). No wonder, for Venus appears in the finale of the first episode of Ovid's "Aeneid", which is our subject. Actually, the daughters of Anius will be changed into white doves, birds sacred to Venus,

as Anius states expressly when he says to Anchises (673-674): "into the birds of your consort" *tuaeque / coniugis in uolucres* (where *coniunx* evidently is a euphemism). Quite appropriately, our story opens a section dominated by Venus in different aspects. According to current opinion the *Metamorphoses*, and particularly its last books, were written in a hurry and the work is therefore lacking in unity. We will have to ask ourselves if such a view can bear up under closer scrutiny.

Another deity important to the larger context of the scene under consideration is Apollo. In our text, Aeneas, carrying his father and guiding his son, is introduced as a man both devoted to the past and looking to the future. As a refugee, he first leaves Troy (627) and then Thrace (the mention of Polydorus reminds us of the Trojan section, cf. 13. 536-575). The first major stop on Aeneas' journey is Delos, called by Ovid "Apollo's city" (631). Apollo, who was the tutelary god of Augustus, had played an important role in the first book; in the last book this god, through his oracle, will refer the Romans to his son (15. 637-640): "You need not Apollo but his son." Although in this context Aesculapius is meant, Ovid's readers must have been familiar with the legend according to which Augustus was Apollo's son; this god had appeared to Atia in his temple in the guise of a snake (Suet., *Aug.* 94. 4). Hence, in the first story of Ovid's "Aeneid" there appears a thread leading from Apollo to Augustus. Now Anius is Phoebus' priest and a king (632); the verb *colere* embraces both functions. He receives Aeneas in the temple and at his home; the closeness of the temple to the ruler's house is again reminiscent of Augustus. The king shows his guest (634) the city, the very place where Apollo and Diana were born (a reminiscence of Book 6). After a sacrifice they attend a banquet. The mention of Ceres and Bacchus here is not pointless, because bread and wine will be important in the following narrative. Then Anchises' question about Anius' children (640-642) opens the narrative proper.

An Artful Introduction: Deliberate Use of Tenses

Before we go on, let us have a look at the formal devices of narrative technique in this introduction. The adversative conjunction *tamen* stresses an opposition to the preceding context, namely the destruction of Troy vs. the persistence of hope, and thus marks a transition from one section of the *Metamorphoses* to another. When describing

Aeneas and his journey up to Delos, Ovid constantly uses the present tense (624-631). More important, however, is the action on Delos, where the historical perfect gives more weight to the reception of Aeneas by Anius (633). This is preceded by a secondary clause in the imperfect, a tense appropriate for exposition, and is followed by the ambiguous form *ostendit* (634) which in this context must be considered a perfect. At this point Ovid's use of a slightly more complicated syntax indicates his intention to dwell on this story. The formalities of the rite are quickly dispensed with in ablative absolutes (636-637) while the historical present helps to describe the passing to the king's hall and the beginning of the banquet. In the announcement of Anchises' question, the devices hitherto used are outdone by ellipsis: *tum pius Anchises* (Anius' answer is introduced by means of a participle related to the subject, a new device in the present context).

In this introduction the means of narrative technique are arranged in a gradation: Ovid uses the present to give the theme and the antecedents, the imperfect to expound the background of the main action, the historical perfect in order to emphasize this action, the historical present to describe detail, and, finally, ellipsis to obtain a still stronger effect.

Let us now consider the transition to the narrative proper. Anius' answer in each detail corresponds to Anchises' question. Anchises addresses Anius very politely: "O chosen priest of Apollo" (*o Phoebi lecte sacerdos* 640), and Anius responds in kind: "Greatest of heroes" (*heros maxime* 644-645). The question *fallor?* (641) is echoed by the answer *non falleris* (644). *Vidi* (641) is confirmed by *uidisti* (645), as is the number of Anius' children. In the forms *uidisti / uides* (645; 647) the unhappy present is opposed to the happy past. The description of misery is then interrupted by a parenthesis and so accentuated (646); for, by inserting the sentence about the fickleness of fortune, Ovid delays the main thought and thus confers greater importance to it. This effect is enhanced by the placement of the most bitter words at the beginning of the next hexameter: *paene uides orbum* (647). Anius, who has not yet begun his story, has to explain, first of all, where his son is at this moment, a problem which Ovid deals with in the form of a rhetorical question. The mention of the gift of prophecy, given by Apollo to Anius' son (650), then occasions the mention of the exceptional gift conferred by Bacchus upon Anius' daughters; this is a parallel to the motif fundamental to the story. Although at this point

Ovid stresses the greatness of the god's favour "exceeding both wish and credibility" (*uoto maiora fideque* 651); words which emphasize the miraculous qualities of the gift, the rest of the story will show that this excessive honour proved a burden. Thus, the "helpful" divine intervention at the end cannot be mentioned without sceptical irony: "And he who had granted the gift brought help, if you call it help to destroy someone miraculously" (*tulitque / muneris auctor opem, si miro perdere more / ferre uocatur opem* 669-671). What had been a pious phrase acquires sarcastic poignancy in retrospect: "The god granted our wish beyond our prayers and understanding".

The narrative has not yet started, however. The tenses have so far had the function not of narration, but of statement (witness *dedit*, twice in line 650). *Nam* finally marks the transition to the narrative (652), as it does frequently in Ovid. Here it does not introduce a causal clause but a detailed explanation; it does not mean "since" but "in fact"; and that is the reason why the great French scholar Georges Lafaye does not translate it. The imperfect, which is typical of exposition, is used to explain the nature of the gift (the faculty of changing anything into bread, wine, or oil), and the advantage of having such daughters.

The Narrative, I: Loyalty Defeated by Fear

With the main action comes a new character, Agamemnon. A temporal clause establishes the links between him and the other characters: "As soon as the son of Atreus had learned this" (*hoc ubi cognouit ... Atrides* 655). This relatively long period contains a participle related to the subject (*armorum uiribus usus* 657). The main action is narrated in the historical present and ends with a subordinate clause of exhortation: Anius' daughters have to provide the food for the Greek army. The tight sentence structure corresponds to Agamemnon's speed and efficiency. A parenthesis then adds to the suspense (656-657), at once foreshadowing unfortunate events and recalling the Trojan War. The lengthy sentence concerning Agamemnon is followed by a very short one about the daughters (660): each of them flees where she can. The poet continues to use the historical present. More precise information is added in the form of a non-narrative perfect (660-661). Then the narrative is resumed in the historical present: "A force arrives and threatens war" *miles adest et ... bella minatur* (662). The narrator reserves the perfect tense for the crucial event, the sisters

delivered to the enemy by their own brother. The same tense (now with use of ellipsis) serves to express the end of the conflict between different emotions in the brother's heart: "Loyalty defeated by fear" (*uicta metu pietas* 663). Anius adds a justifying remark addressed to Anchises: "You might forgive the brother" *possis ignoscere fratri* (664). This subjective element in Ovid's narrative, though slightly surprising in epic poetry, is understandable here because of his technique of embedding a story within a story; nevertheless, Ovid makes similar remarks elsewhere in his own person (1. 162; 6. 23; 7. 85). This paragraph leads into a supplementary explanation (for which the imperfect is the proper tense): "On the island of Andros there were no such heroes as Aeneas or Hector, by whose aid you Trojans held out for ten years" (a statement made in the perfect). Anius tactfully passes over the fact that they were finally beaten.

The Narrative, II: Salvation through Destruction

Iam signals that a new scene begins in line 667. The imperfect *parabantur* gives the exposition, the girls' cry for help is stressed by the historical perfect, and the accompanying gesture is related by means of a participle. Note how the poet enhances the syntactic tension with hyperbaton, by inserting direct speech into the main sentence. The perfect *dixere* (669) concludes the speech and at the same time continues the narrative. The intervention of the god is also narrated in the historical perfect in due harmony with its importance. The urgent request is put into the imperative *fer opem* (669) and its fulfillment in the indicative of the same verb (*tulitque ... opem* 669-670). The very repetition of words helps to bring out the change of perspective and, almost magically, draws the reader into the action. There is more: the narrator adds a personal comment, repeating the words *ferre ... opem* (670-671) to correct them; indeed, in this case, help was equivalent to destruction. This time the verb appears in the infinitive (*ferre opem*), only to be redefined in terms of its contrary (*perdere*). In contrast to his usual practice, Ovid cannot describe this metamorphosis since his narrator, Anius, was not present. A parallel case is the metamorphosis of the daughters of Minyas, which could not be described, Ovid says, since it happened in the darkness (4. 409 f.) By stressing such exceptions to his omniscience as a narrator, Ovid tries to enhance the credibility of all the other metamorphoses he describes.

The finale is extremely brief. First there is a sentence of four words, which are phonetically only three[1] (*summa mali nota est* 673). Then, there follows a sentence of only two words: "took wings" (*pennas sumpsere* 673). The considerable acceleration towards the end of the narrative is typical of Ovid's technique. The narrative, as previously mentioned, ends with an allusion to Venus, whose birds are the doves.

Ovid's Narrative Technique: Towards a "Textual Syntax"

Looking back at Anius' story, we find an ample exposition (644-654) followed by three scenes:

1. Agamemnon tries to abduct the daughters and they flee (655-661).
2. The brother is compelled by force to hand them over to the enemy (662-666).
3. The sisters are changed into doves (667-674).

The first and the second scene together form a unit of 12 lines; 2 lines serve as a transition between two groups of 5 lines. The exposition proper consists of 8 lines (647-654), as does the finale which matches it symmetrically. Bacchus intervenes at the beginning and at the end, first accompanied by Apollo and then by Venus who are both crucial to this section of the *Metamorphoses.* Bacchus is used as a figure of transition also in Book 11 where he punishes the Mænads and answers the prayer of Midas. In fact, there are parallels to our text: Bacchus gives Midas a dangerous gift, as he does to Anius' daughters, and in both cases a king tries to make evil use of the god's gift.

Let us now draw some conclusions. As for the structure of the *Metamorphoses* as a whole, the myth of Midas in Book 11, in which Bacchus intervenes as often as in the Anius story, was usually considered to be an appendix to the Orpheus section. We have seen parallels between the Midas story, which precedes the foundation of Troy, and the Anius story, which follows the destruction of that city. Therefore, it seems more adequate to interpret the Midas story as a kind of preface to the Trojan section, and the story of Anius' daughters as an epilogue to it. Moreover, we have seen that in this narrative Ovid introduces gods and characters which will dominate

---

1 Such brevity is difficult to obtain in English: "But I do know the final issue of this calamity" (M.M.Innes, quoted above, n. 1, p. 156). See, however, A.D.Melville (Oxford, 1986; paperback: 1987): "The bitter end's well known."

the following section of the *Metamorphoses*. Hence, our story has an axial function within the poem.

The structure of our narrative shows some features typical of Ovid. He loves ample and detailed introductions, but cuts short the ending of the narrative. He uses the narrative tenses ingeniously: while the imperfect furnishes preliminary information or supplementary explanations, the perfect, as an historical tense, is more charged with meaning than the present. These linguistic means and stylistic devices are skilfully arranged. Ovid has at his disposal an entire gamut of means of expression, one stronger than the other. The same is true of the length of sentences: it is not by chance that the most complex sentence describes Agamemnon's intervention. Secondary clauses and participles are used at the most dramatic moments. Insertions, such as parentheses, build suspense and give more prominence to the surrounding sentence by "spacing" its words. Even more typical of Ovid is the practice of taking up certain words from changing points of view.

Two conclusions present themselves; one of them is known though not always taken into account: Ovid's narrative, by its subjectivity, is distinct from grand epic and closer to Ariosto and Byron. The communication between author and reader, lively as it is in our poem, in this passage is additionally refined by the author's use of a narrator. The second aspect we would like to stress is almost entirely unrecognized, namely the brevity which is typical of our text, the deliberate and economical use of words and narrative devices, the strictly functional character of the narrative technique. All this reveals a surprising terseness, a severe and sober conciseness, which one would not have expected to find in an author whom our manuals call loquacious and wordy. In addition, our results show that the traditional theory of a hasty and disconnected composition of the last books of the *Metamorphoses* does not bear closer examination.

It remains to ask whether and to what extent some categories of narrative theory are applicable to our text.

1. There is, as is to be expected, an introduction, and even a very full one, subdivided into several parts.
2. There is the narrative proper, consisting of
   a) the setting and the antecedents (Bacchus' gift),
   b) the "test": Agamemnon asking the sisters to let him exploit the god's gift for selfish purposes,

c) the "meritorious reaction" of the sisters, their refusal to obey,
d) the helpful intervention of the god saving the sisters by changing them into doves.

Yet the "binary" structure applied hitherto proves to be insufficient. Does not Ovid question the behaviour of the god who, under the pretext of saving the girls, destroys them? Such criticism of gods, which is rather frequent in Ovid, is not provided for by the binary system and makes it difficult to adopt the scheme.

Another difficulty results from the diversity of function of Ovidian stories and from the way they are inserted into the whole of the *Metamorphoses.* Not only do we find in this work stories expressly introduced as *exempla* such as Philemon and Baucis ("Heaven's power is boundless" *immensa est ... potentia caeli* 8. 618) or Byblis ("Byblis affords a warning to other girls to love only what is permitted" *Byblis in exemplo est, ut ament concessa puellae* 9. 454), but also ætiological myths (explaining the origin of a name or of a real phenomenon). In order to find a "unitarian" (non pluralistic) description of Ovidian narrative (if such a description is thought to be desirable), one ought to look out for categories comprehending both *exemplum* and αἴτιον.

As far as the author's standpoint is concerned, Ovid in his self-description avoids the term *legimus,* which is frequent in medieval texts, and prefers *uidi* or *memini,* with which he tries to convey a non-bookish sense of immediate experience. The figure of Anius as a narrator of a story within the story defies the usual categories; since he has not seen the metamorphosis himself, he is only a "secondary" witness, a type of narrator unknown to some theorists.

The analysis of ironical structures as inaugurated by Bakhtin[1] is helpful for its subtlety. In fact, Ovid at the beginning ostensibly adopts traditional ways of thought, but subsequently follows them *ad absurdum* with great consistency (13. 669-671) to question finally the correctness of a positive evaluation of divine behaviour.

One more problem. What can we do in order not to lose sight of the basic fact that our texts develop in the dimension of time, that they imitate communicative acts between persons? Analysing a narrative text as a process involves also taking into account the changes of speed in the different phases of the narrative. Between narrative theory and philology there is the neglected field of "textual syntax", a

---

[1] Cf. our Introduction, esp. pp. 10-11; 13.

syntax not of single sentences but of entire texts. By proceeding from the observation of isolated tenses or sentences to a study of their interrelations, their interaction within a given process of communication, we will, hopefully, be able to analyse the points of contact between narrator and reader and perhaps even between philology and narrative theory.

Epilogue: In the present chapter, our interest was not focused on rhetoric. Direct intertextual relationships to the *Aeneid* are discussed in another chapter (VI. 4. *Clash of Genres*: Gods and Religion in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, above, pp. 177-196). On a more abstract level ("intertextuality" in the broadest sense of the word), our text reveals interesting overlappings of diverse cultural systems: the daughters of Anius represent one aspect of *pietas* (religious devotion), their brother, another (devotion to his family). All these characters are exposed to an encounter with a totally divergent system of values (Agamemnon's militarism) and react differently: the brother sacrifices his *pietas* and delivers his sisters to the enemy whereas the sisters put into practice their *pietas* and pray. The god answers their prayer by changing them into doves. At this moment a third cultural code is introduced by the narrator, Anius, who judges the miracle in secular terms. In his language, this kind of help is called "destruction". By using the verb *uocatur* Ovid intimates that there is a problem of "language", even "translation". More precisely, there is a clash of systems of values, and the same event, viewed in different contexts, acquires a totally different meaning. The rhetorical device of *correctio* helps Anius to make this point. Ovid's predilection for ambiguities of wording and of interpretation is not an idle play on words; it reveals the coexistence of competing cultural codes in a multifaceted world. Without his rhetorical training he would not have been able to verbalize these problems so briefly and properly, problems caused by "intertextual" phenomena in the broadest sense of the word.

CHAPTER SEVEN

ALBINOVANUS PEDO[1]

Elocutio and Defamiliarization
The Thrill of a First Experience

Iamque uident post terga diem solemque relictum
iam pridem,[2] notis extorres finibus orbis,
per non concessas audaces ire tenebras
ad rerum metas extremaque litora mundi.
nunc illum, pigris immania monstra sub undis
qui ferat, Oceanum, qui saeuas undique pristis
aequoreosque canes, ratibus consurgere prensis
(accumulat fragor ipse metus), iam sidere limo
nauigia et rapido desertam flamine classem
seque feris credunt per inertia fata marinis
iam non felici laniandos sorte relinqui.
atque aliquis prora caecum sublimis ab alta
aera pugnaci luctatus rumpere uisu,
ut nihil erepto ualuit dinoscere mundo,
obstructa in talis effundit pectora uoces:
quo ferimur? fugit ipse dies orbemque relictum
ultima perpetuis claudit natura tenebris.
anne alio positas ultra sub cardine gentes
atque alium flabris[3] intactum quaerimus orbem?
di reuocant rerumque uetant cognoscere finem
mortales oculos: aliena quid aequora remis
et sacras uiolamus aquas diuumque quietas
turbamus sedes?

And now they see day and sun long left behind; banished from the familiar limits of the world they dare to pass through forbidden shades to the bounds of things, the remotest shores of the world. Now they think Ocean, that breeds beneath its sluggish waves terrible monsters, (5) savage sea-beasts everywhere, and dogs[4] of the sea, is rising, taking the ships with it

---

[1] Text and translation: M.Winterbottom, (ed.) *The Elder Seneca* (Cambridge, Mass., 1974): vol. 2, Sen., *Suas.* 1. 15.

[2] *Iamque uident ... iam pridem* Kent after Withof: *iam pridem ... iam quidem* (*quidam* A).

[3] *flabris* Haupt: *lib(e)ris*

[4] Sharks (cf. Italian *pesce cane*). The standard dictionary of K.E.Georges is misleading in this case (*Ausführliches lateinisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch* [Hannover, 8th ed. 1918, repr. Basel, 1951]).

(the very noise increases their fears): now they think the vessels are sinking in the mud, the fleet deserted by the swift wind, themselves left by indolent fate to the sea-beasts, (10) to be torn apart unhappily. Someone high on the prow struggles to break through the blinding mist, his sight battling. He can discern nothing—the world has been snatched away. He pours his frustrated heart into words: (15) 'Where are we being carried? Day itself is in flight, furthest nature shuts off in everlasting shadows the world we have left. Are we looking for races beyond, in another clime, a new world untouched by breezes? The Gods call us back, forbid us to know the end of creation (20) with mortal eyes. Why do our oars violate seas that are not ours, waters that are holy? Why do we disturb the quiet home of the Gods?'

Leaving the Known World

When Germanicus sailed in the North Sea in A.D. 16 (see Tacitus, *Ann.* 2. 23-24), the author of our text probably was one of his officers (Tacitus, *Ann.* 1. 60). The ancients did not distinguish the North Sea from the Ocean, which they imagined to be the frontier of the *oecumene.* Hence, sailing on the Ocean was thought to be equivalent to leaving the inhabited world; the ancients must have felt about it as we do about space flight.

The first paragraph (1-4) conveys this feeling to the reader, though its main function is to give a precise and objective idea of what is going on. Yet the facts themselves are so extraordinary that even the most "objective" approach begs for hyperbolic expression. In the first line the idea is that the sailors have left daylight and sun behind them.[1] This does not merely mean that they are sailing by night, although even this would have been a great achievement, comparable to a night flight in the days of Saint-Exupéry; actually, the fascination of the first sea trip by night had been captured by the poets who described the adventure of the Argonauts (Val. Fl. 2. 34-71; Apollonius Rhodius 4. 1694-1711). Leaving daylight and sun is even more than this: it means going *extra sidera,* to a place outside our familiar time and space. The sailors are *extorres,* exiled from the world known to us. Separation is a main theme throughout our text, and it is graphically reflected in word order: the pattern of line 2 (*notis* extorres *finibus*) will recur in meaningful variations.[2]

---

[1] In this context *uident* is strange, but I have no better suggestion.

[2] *per non concessas* audaces ire *tenebras* (3); *rapido* desertam *flamine* (9); *non felici* laniandos *sorte* (11); *pugnaci* luctatus rumpere *uisu* (13); *erepto* valuit discernere *mundo* (14); *obstructa...* effundit *pectora* (15); *rerumque* vetant cognoscere *finem* (20); *sacras* violamus *aquas* (22); *quietas* turbamus *sedes* (22-23).

The heroes are bold enough to pass through darkness (*tenebrae*), striving to get as far as the bounds of things (*rerum metas*) and to the very border of the universe (*extremaque litora mundi*). *Orbis* and *mundi* are placed in corresponding positions at the ends of lines and arranged so as to form a gradation. The words *non concessas* suggest that a taboo is being broken, and the adjective *audax* (reminiscent of Horace, *carm.* 1. 3. 25) seems to convey the idea of ὕβρις. Yet, in this first paragraph, Pedo dwells rather on the antithesis of *post* and *ad* as well as *extorres* and *audaces.* Both adjectives are placed in analogous positions, one of them pointing to the past, the other to the future. These adjectives help to locate the heroes in the no man's land between the known world they left and the unknown world they have not yet reached. The importance of the exploit is enhanced by the use of the word *extorres* which has a legal and peremptory ring. In addition, this paragraph exhibits a great number of spondees[1] which, together with the choice of words and the parallelism of metre and internal rhymes in lines 2 and 3, show the pathos of the adventure. The *grauitas* of the first paragraph is unmistakable.

The Horrors of the Sea

The second paragraph stresses the horror of the sea. The paragraph is subdivided by *nunc* (5) and *iam* (8); there is an antithesis between the ship being raised by the Ocean or getting stuck in the mud. The contrasting verbs *consurgere* and *sidere* have corresponding positions in subsequent lines. Both halves of the antithesis are separated by a parenthesis.[2] The slow movement of the waves and the size of the sea monsters are emphasized by spondees (5 *nunc illum pigris immania*; 6 *saeuas ... pristis*). On the other hand, dactylic rhythms convey the nervous anxiety of the men on board (*accumulat fragor ipse metus*). The idea that the wind might stop blowing is accompanied by a rhythm which becomes slower and heavier: *nauigia et rapido desertam* (9), ddss. Hence, the dactyls and the spondees in this section[3] are distributed so as to add *grauitas* to the first and last lines, (three spondees each in lines 5 and 11) and to give a nervous movement to the central part (only one spondee in each of lines 7 and 8).

---

[1] 1 dsds, 2 ssss, 3 ssss, 4 sssd.

[2] Punctuation according to Gertz, accepted by Winterbottom.

[3] 5 sssd, 6 ddss, 7 ddds, 8 ddds, 9 ddss, 10 dsdd, 11 ssds.

In the second paragraph, adjectives stress the lack of concern on the part of both the Ocean and of Fate (*pigris* [5], *inertia* [10]) and the bulk and cruelty of the sea animals (*immania* [5], *saeuas* [6]). These adjectives are "subjective", reflecting the feelings of the passive humans, depersonalized into victims of animals. On the other hand, the Ocean is personified as an acting subject seizing the ship (7); the monsters accompanying it conjure up reminiscences from visual art and thus add to the personification (and to the horror of the scene). People are simply left to their frightened imaginations (one terror is heaped upon another, 8). From one moment to another they firmly believe (10 *credunt* which is stronger than *putant*) that this or that danger has come true, now anticipating a swift and pitiless death, now a slow and no less cruel one. The nouns *fata* and *sorte* stress irrevocability.

Vain Efforts

The third paragraph (12-15), which prepares the short speech to follow (16-23), establishes that the sight of the humans is impaired. There is some irony in the fact that, despite his high perch on the prow, the speaker is not able to see anything. Great stress is laid on activity; *pugnax uisus* is an interesting metaphor showing that the ancients thought seeing to be an active process produced by the eye. Here the verbs get an important function: in line 13 *luctatus rumpere* contrasts with *nihil ualuit*, and *obstructa*[1] with *effundit*.

The distribution of dactyls and spondees,[2] in harmony with the content, exhibits several starts, which are at once suppressed. In the first two lines we have dsss twice, and at the end there are even four spondees. Paradoxically this paragraph shows a man in desperate action when there is no possibility of acting.

The last paragraph, in the form of a speech, reviews some of the ideas initially expounded from a different viewpoint. *Fugit ipse dies* (16) implies an inversion of perspective as compared to line 1 (*diem ... relictum*), which had been the more usual approach. Although the speaker is human, the perspective is not man's, but nature's and the gods', who are the acting subjects in affirmative sentences. Mortals, on the other hand, are passive (*ferimur* 16); all of their actions are referred to in rhetorical questions which express futility.

---

1 *Obstructa ... in ... pectora* is Bursian's reading.
2 12 dsss, 13 dsss, 14 dsds, 15 ssss.

Rhythm and Meaning

In the speech the style is even more "musical" than in the preceding paragraphs. Its first line (16) exhibits a tripartite structure *quo ferimur? / fugit ipse dies / orbemque relictum.* The second line is a perfect "golden line" with a central caesura (17): *ultima perpetuis claudit natura tenebris.* The pattern is: a b c a' b'. Line 18 is tripartite again; the context, interrupted at the trithemimeres, is resumed at the hephthemimeres. In line 19 there is hyperbaton between trithemimeres and the end of the line, in line 20 rhyme between trithemimeres and hephthemimeres; line 21 is bipartite, line 22 is tripartite. There is much variation of caesuras in the speech. How about dactyls and spondees? A closer analysis shows correspondence of rhythm and meaning: in line 16 the swift dactylic movement (ddds) suits the idea of flight (*fugit*); in the following line the rhythm slows down in accordance with the idea that everything is enclosed in darkness. Lines 18-19 are questions with heavy spondees in the second halves of the lines. Line 20 is especially elegant with its alternating dactyls and spondees, combined with a tripartite subdivision. In line 21 we observe an acceleration, together with the raising of a new question (*aliena quid* ...). Then the rhythm gradually slows down (sdsd, 22) to end with two spondees (ss). The ritardando is in harmony with the idea of the "quiet home" of the gods. A conscious use of the placement of words is especially notable in the last sentences (see n. 3).

Rhetoric in the Service of Poetry

Throughout our text, linguistic and stylistic devices are systematically exploited to serve poetic intentions. This is especially true of graphic word order, bold metaphors (cf. 13), and the use of tenses. While Cornelius Severus, in using the historic perfect, had followed the habits of prose, Albinovanus, in unison with the traditions of epic poetry, constantly prefers the historic present. Yet the study of rhetoric was not lost on Pedo; witness the rhetorical questions in the speech and the unusual length (by Augustan standards) of the period in paragraph two, which allows us to get a quantitative idea of what Seneca meant when he praised Pedo's *spiritus.* But there is more to this praise: the verve of the poet animates the magnificent hyperboles of the first paragraph, the ample antitheses of the second, the frustrated struggle for perception in the third, and in the final

speech, the reference to nature and gods. Behind the structure of the text we notice a rhetorical pattern, the principle of climax. What happens here, Pedo says, is beyond our familiar time and world, beyond human feelings and dimensions, beyond human perception, and even beyond nature's and the gods' laws.

Thanks to this rhetorical arrangement of thoughts, the poet has succeeded in making a familiar event look strange and new. Far from enslaving our author, rhetoric, by enhancing his powers of invention, disposition, and diction, gave him the freedom to take a fresh view of things.

A Poet Between two Epochs

How is our text related to its epoch? Strong reservations against the boundless expansion of the Roman Empire were, if unpopular with the senators, not at all alien to the emperors. Non-expansion was said to be one of the secret commands of the dying Augustus to his heir, Tiberius. If Germanicus' spectacular expeditions did not win the full approval of Tiberius, in the monarch's eyes this was due to that doctrine; in the senators' eyes it was due to the emperor's envy. The gloomy scene in the leaden darkness of the North Sea marvellously crystalizes the feelings which the very best of the senators had concerning the futility of their endeavours. There is even a strong hint in our text at an alternative goal, the quiet dwelling of the gods, which should not be intruded upon by technology and warfare, but legitimately reached by philosophical contemplation. The reminiscences from Lucretius (cf. Lucr. 3. 18 with Pedo 22 f.) point in this direction, namely to give a new goal to Roman intellectuals once political and military success had become the privilege of the emperor.

Pedo's narrative replaces the calculated balance of late Augustan style (as represented by Ovid) with a new striving for compact and succinct expression;[1] consider, for example, the abrupt ending of line 4, the intricate structure of lines 5-11, and the concentration of metaphors in line 13. These features announce Valerius Flaccus, while the more balanced structure of the speech (16-23) recalls Ovid. With respect to his style, Albinovanus is located between these two poets, a view which will be confirmed by our next chapter.

---

[1] In this respect, Phaedrus and Valerius Maximus, for all their differences, exhibit common features.

Epilogue: Rhetorical means are exploited to form an impressive *gradatio* and to make the events look new by using unfamiliar expressions. Direct intertextual allusions to Lucretius establish a link to natural philosophy. On a more abstract level, Pedo dwells on the clash between two antagonistic realms, the known world, the laws of which are familiar to us, and the impenetrable darkness of the unknown. Since chaos does not have any system, the conflict between cosmos and chaos is interpreted in theological terms: not content with his own world, man is said to disturb the quiet abodes of the gods and encroaches on their rights. Thus, Albinovanus seems to translate a clash of codes into the language of epic tradition,[1] but it is not by chance that he adopts Lucretius' words. Lucan will take the next step and replace mythical theology with natural philosophy.

[1] A first example of human transgression was Diomedes in the 5th Book of the *Iliad*; the subject was developed in anthropological terms by Sophocles (*Antigone* 332-383), Euripides and Ennius (*Medea*), Horace (*Carm.* 1. 3), and others. Apollonius 4. 1694-1711 does not discuss the anthropological problem.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CORNELIUS SEVERUS

Death and Poetic Survival of Oratory

For a study of the relations between poetry and rhetoric it might prove rewarding to look at a text on the death of a great orator written by an epic poet. Before we try to describe the roles of poetry and rhetoric, let us consider the text as a whole.

Oraque magnanimum spirantia paene uirorum
in rostris iacuere suis; sed enim abstulit omnis,
tamquam sola foret, rapti Ciceronis imago.
tunc redeunt animis ingentia consulis acta
iurataeque manus deprensaque foedera noxae
patriciumque nefas extinctum: poena Cethegi
deiectusque redit uotis Catilina nefandis.
quid fauor aut coetus, pleni quid honoribus anni
profuerant? sacris exculta quid artibus aetas?
abstulit una dies aeui decus, ictaque luctu
conticuit Latiae tristis facundia linguae.
unica sollicitis quondam tutela salusque,
egregium semper patriae caput, ille senatus
uindex, ille fori, legum ritusque togaeque,
publica uox saeuis aeternum obmutuit armis.
informes uoltus sparsamque cruore nefando
canitiem sacrasque manus operumque ministras
tantorum pedibus ciuis proiecta superbis
proculcauit ouans nec lubrica fata deosque
respexit. nullo luet hoc Antonius aeuo.
hoc nec in Emathio mitis uictoria Perse
nec te, dire Syphax, non fecit <in> hoste Philippo;
inque triumphato ludibria cuncta Iugurtha
afuerunt, nostraeque cadens ferus Hannibal irae
membra tamen Stygias tulit inuiolata sub umbras.

The heads of great-hearted men, still almost breathing,
Lay on the rostra that were theirs: but all were swept away
By the sight of the ravaged Cicero, as though he lay alone.
Then they recalled the great deeds of his consulship,
The conspiracy, the wicked plot he uncovered,
The aristocrat's crime he smothered; they recalled
Cethegus' punishment, Catiline cast down from his impious hopes.

What availed his popularity with the mob, his years
Full of honour, his life adorned by sacred arts?
One day took away the glory of an age, and struck by grief
The eloquence of the Latin tongue grew dumb with sadness.
Once the sole guard and saviour of the distressed,
Always the glorious leader of his country, champion
Of the senate, bar, laws, ritual, civil life,
Voice of the public—now silenced for ever by cruel arms.
The defaced countenance, white hairs horribly sprinkled
With blood, the sacred hands, that had served such great works,
His countryman threw down and trampled with haughty feet,
In triumph, not thinking of fate's slipperiness
Or the gods. Antony will never pay in full for this.
Victory was kind, and never did such a thing
To Emathian Perses, dire Syphax or our enemy Philip.
When Jugurtha was led in triumph, there was
No mockery, and when fierce Hannibal fell to our wrath
He took unharmed limbs down to the shades of Styx.[1]

Cicero's Uniqueness

The first three lines serve as an introduction: the sight of Cicero's head makes the onlooker forget all of the other murdered orators exposed on the rostra. The main idea (*rapti Ciceronis imago*) is, as it were, prepared in concentric circles, and meaningfully placed at the end of this paragraph. The first sentence hints at the main theme by not speaking of "heads" but of *ora*—the mouth as the instrument of the speaker is strongly related to *rostra* by the possessive pronoun *suis*. At the very place of their action, the speakers lie dead, their mouths still exhaling. In the Latin text there is an interplay between *magnanimum* and *spirantia* as the poet makes us feel that the greatness of the spirit of those men does not allow them to be dead (this will be part of the argument of the following paragraph; the contrast between *spirantia* and *iacuere* is reinforced by the very setting). The plural used in line 1 and the general term *magnanimum uirorum* are replaced in line 3 by the singular, and by Cicero's own name. In the second sentence suspense is created before the important final words by the

---

[1] The best edition and translation of the fragment is found in: Seneca the Elder, *Declamations*, vol. II, ed. by M.Winterbottom (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1974), *Suas.* 6. 26. In line 14, the manuscripts (and Winterbottom) read *ritus* whereas all other editors adopt Heinsius' conjecture *iuris*. As for the rest of the text, all modern editors agree, see *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum*, ed. W.Morel (Leipzig, 2nd ed., 1927), rev. by K.Büchner (Leipzig, 1982), replaced by J.Blänsdorf (Stuttgart, 1995) and E.Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993).

inserted phrase *tamquam sola foret. Sola* as opposed to *omnis* strongly emphasizes Cicero's uniqueness and, at the same time, suggests that he is a figure of general importance, a representative of more than merely himself.

His Greatness Attested Even by Catiline

The next paragraph (4-7) is clearly isolated from its surroundings: its first and its last line contain the only present tenses in our text; the recurrence of the verb *redire* helps to frame the paragraph which, at the beginning, is clearly marked by *tunc*, a temporal adverb usually introducing important events. The content accords with the expectations roused by the lavish use of formal devices as the poet conjures up the vision of Cicero's greatest achievements and graphically puts them before the eyes of the reader. By making different events (*acta, manus, foedera, nefas*) the grammatical subjects of the first sentence, he almost personifies them. In the second sentence *poena Cethegi* is followed by *deiectus Catilina*: the last figures of the second paragraph are single persons; in the second paragraph, as in the first, the movement leads from the general to the particular. Personification is facilitated by the combination of past participles with nouns in the nominative (such as *deiectus Catilina*), often translated in modern languages by an abstract noun combined with the genitive of another noun (e.g. *deprensa foedera* the disclosure of the plot); there is only one example of this type in our text, *poena Cethegi*. It is a fine touch that among Cicero's deeds Catiline himself "comes back" as a kind of *revenant* to attest to Cicero's greatness. As for emotional color, this paragraph, like the former, starts with high praise (*magnanimum* 1; *ingentia* 4) and leads to abhorrence (*rapti* 3; *noxae* 5; *nefas* 6; *nefandis* 7).[1] In the second paragraph the emotional force, far stronger than in the first, helps to emphasize Cicero's moral superiority over his enemies.

A Catastrophe for Roman Culture

The following paragraph (8-11) strikes a completely different chord; none of Cicero's great achievements helped him. The anaphora of

[1] We will find the same contrast in the following paragraphs lines 8-11 *fauor, honoribus, sacris, decus* versus *luctu* and *tristis*. Lines 12-15 *unica, egregium* versus *saeuis*.

quid gives intensity to the rhetorical questions in lines 8-9. The strong tricolon is brutally eclipsed by the following short sentence *abstulit una dies aeui decus* (10). There is a meaningful crescendo from *anni* through *aetas* to *aeui*, a word which denotes a span of time longer than an individual's lifetime and thereby suggests that Cicero's death has an importance transcending his person. This is explicitly stated in the final sentence: with his death the eloquence of the Latin tongue grew dumb with sadness. A line of thought which we observed in the first paragraph is now applied to the sphere of culture: not only did his studies of the "sacred arts" not avail him, but his death is a catastrophe for Roman culture.

Public Voice Brought to Silence

In a brilliant chain of pointed expressions, the next paragraph (12-15) emphasizes the importance of Cicero the citizen, defender of the distressed, head of the country, champion of the senate, the bar, and the laws, and exponent of civil power (*toga* as opposed to *arma*). Here, in an allusion, full of tragic irony, to Cicero's famous and ill-famed line "Let the weapons yield to the toga" *cedant arma togae*,[1] the poet places the keywords *toga* (civil power) and *arma* (military power) at the ends of two consecutive lines and thus denounces the cruel reversal of that noble maxim. With Cicero's death the voice of the Republic (*publica uox*) was silenced forever. From a helper of citizens and a supporter of institutions, Cicero is built up to represent the Republic as a whole. This statement strongly implies that at Severus' time there was no longer any voice of the Republic (cf. *aeternum*). Our poet is daring enough to state that in his epoch there is no public voice. Cicero's death was an even greater loss to political life than to cultural life.

Reversal of Natural Order

Lines 16-20 are the emotional culmination of the entire text. This paragraph is the first to start with strongly negative adjectives, and it keeps this atmosphere throughout. The beginnings and the endings of the lines are especially charged with emotion and meaning (cf. *informes, canitiem, tantorum, proculcauit, respexit*; *nefando, superbis, deusque,*

---

[1] Cicero, *Frg.* 16 Morel = 13 Blänsdorf = 13 Courtney.

aeuo). The contrast of *ministras* and *superbis* (17 and 18) shows the difference of attitude separating Cicero from Antony. The sequence *uultus - manus - pedibus* reveals Antony's reversal of the natural order: the feet are above head and hands. The horror of wounds brings the dead Hector to mind (Virgil, *Aeneid* 2. 272-279); the blind and short-sighted triumph of Antony recalls Turnus spoiling Pallas (cf. especially the use of the third person in the poet's comment: "There will come a time for Turnus ..." *Turno tempus erit* ... (*Aen.* 10. 503), and "Antony will never pay in full for this" *nullo luet hoc Antonius aeuo*). This strong final phrase in its laconic peremptoriness outdoes even the ornate pathos of the preceding long sentence.

A Citizen Treated Worse than Rome's Enemies

The last paragraph (21-25) gives a list of great foreign enemies who were treated with more clemency by the victorious Romans than Cicero was, even though a citizen. Such paradoxes strongly appealed to the Romans' taste for rhetoric, as is confirmed by a similar passage in Juvenal (10, 286-288), who injected the grand style of declamation into Roman satire. The keyword *hoste* in line 22 in a calculated clash with *ciuis* (18) links the two concluding paragraphs. *Mitis uictoria* is not only the grammatical subject, but a personification which should perhaps be spelled with a capital letter. She is Roman victory as opposed to the individual cruelty of Antony.

Rhetorical Devices

There is much rhetoric in this text: the use of historical examples (21-25), personification (3-15 and 21); metaphor (*caput* 13), metonymy (*toga* 14), anaphora (8-9; 21-22), antithesis. A considerable degree of variation precludes excessive symmetry; the final paragraph, for example, shows four different ways of expressing negation, *nec* (twice), *non* and the prefixes *a-* and *in-*. Similarly, in the list of Cicero's actions, *poena Cethegi* syntactically deviates from the pattern followed by the rest of the examples, and there is no strict parallelism of meaning even between seemingly parallel elements such as *iurataeque manus* and *deprensaque foedera.* In the multitude of titles conferred on Cicero by the poet we find no continuous increase of length; rather, we have a twofold anticlimax which leads into the short colon *publica uox* and conveys the feeling of a voice dying away.

More revealing than style are invention and disposition. After a comprehensive view of Cicero's deeds there follows the description of the cultural loss and the political loss. Finally Antony's cruelty is opposed to Roman clemency. The general tendency in each paragraph is to show that Cicero's impact went far beyond his personal life and that in each individual case he touched on larger issues important to the whole of the community. This principle, which might be labelled *amplificatio*, was shown by T.Zielinski[1] to have been one of Cicero's greatest achievements in his speeches and one of the reasons why they were read and re-read by later generations. Severus avails himself of this principle in reference to Cicero.

Poetic Technique

Having considered the rhetorical aspects of our text, let us now look at its poetic aspects, starting with the use of metre and the exploitation of the placement of words within each line. Reading our text aloud, we notice that the majority of the words which produce spondees are loaded with strong emotions;[2] the few that remain serve as pauses for effect before important words, such as *tamquam* (3) before *sola*. This shows that the poet consciously adapted the rhythm to the context and to declamation, in accordance with the teachings of ancient theory which ascribed *grauitas* to the spondee. This use of spondees helps to convey *pathos* to the reader. It is certainly not by chance that the most emotional paragraph (16-20) starts with three spondees (sssd; a pattern unique in this text) and contains two other lines containing three spondees, line 18 in the middle of a paragraph and line 20 at its end. Similarly the weighty final line of the preceding paragraph (15), ended with three spondees (a more intellectual type of poetic rhetoric is used by Lucretius who exploits the spondees to stress words that are essential to his philosophical message).[3] In Severus, the contrast between Cicero's cruel degradation (16-20) and the mild treatment of foreign enemies (21-25) is emphasized by the

[1] *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, 1897; 3rd ed., 1912; repr. Darmstadt, 1967): *passim.*

[2] *Spirantia; rostris; tamquam; rapti; ingentia; iuratae; deprensa; extinctum; deiectus; uotis; coetus; pleni; sacris; aeui; tristis; quondam; semper; uindex; legum; saeuis; uoltus; sparsam; sacras; tantorum; ciuis; nec; respexit; nullo; hoc Antonius; mitis; non fecit; triumphato ludibria.*

[3] Cf. M.von Albrecht, *Römische Poesie. Texte und Interpretationen* (Heidelberg, 1977; 2nd ed., Tübingen, 1995): ch. II, esp. 52-53, with nn. 40 and 41.

relative frequency of spondees in lines 16-20 and by their decreasing number in the last paragraph up to the exceptionally fluid final line, which consists purely of dactyls.

Severus pays close attention to the placement of words within the line to construct meaningful word-architecture and to draw clear parallels and contrasts.[1] Thus, the euphonic correspondence between the middle and the end of a line is only used in the closing lines of paragraphs, except for the final paragraph where it is more frequent. The poet does not stick to certain places in the lines to produce antitheses; he prefers to vary the positions of contrasting terms (e.g. *omnis* at the end of line 2; *sola* at the second place in line 3). A good example of variation of placement is the series of questions in lines 8-9 where, in three subsequent sentences, *quid* appears in the first, then the second, and finally the third place. There are long-distance antitheses too, such as *nefandis* at the end of line 7 and *sacris* in the second place of line 9 or *ciuis* after the second caesura of line 18 and *hoste* after the bucolic diæresis in line 22. This discretion gives to Severus' style a continuous flow and a dignified gait which places it between Virgil's majestic fluency, on the one hand, and Ovid's reverberating rhythm or Lucan's brilliant chains of antitheses, on the other.

The imagery is treated so as to safeguard the unity of the passage; *ora* is the keyword. In the first paragraph it is developed by the notion of breath while, at the same time, oratory is alluded to in the mention of *rostra*. At the end of the third paragraph, Severus emphasizes the silence of eloquence. At the end of the fourth paragraph, it is the end of free speech. The fifth paragraph powerfully uses the images of the face, the grey hair, the hands, and the feet to denounce the reversal of natural order whereas in the last paragraph there is only a general mention of *membra*. Hence, the imagery is successively developed in terms of culture, politics, and the laws of nature. Also noteworthy is the use of vocabulary of time. In lines 8-10 *anni*, *aetas*, *aeui* serve to show Cicero as the pride of an entire age, and to stress that Antony, in no age to come, will be able to pay for his guilt (20). The adjective *aeternum* (15) intimates that the Republic has been lost forever; the parallel helps to explain the extent of Antony's guilt.

---

[1] Correspondence between penthemimeres and end of line: 1; 11; 15; 20; 21; 22; 23; 25. Correspondence of trithemimeres and hephthemimeres: line 2 only. Parallel or contrasting words at the end of consecutive lines: 8-9; 14-15; 17-18; 21-23; juxtapostion of opposites: 10 *dies aeui*.

Epilogue: At crucial points of the text, different devices conspire to produce the effect intended by the poet. This alone suffices to show that behind our text there is a poet's mind at work and that all means of expression, regardless of whether we call them poetic or rhetorical, are used by him in a functional way. Severus' achievement in this field might confirm what his friend Ovid wrote in a letter to the orator: "And as your eloquence endows my verse with strength, so splendour comes from us into your words" *utque meis numeris tua dat facundia neruos, / sic uenit a nobis in tua uerba nitor.* What kind of "strength" did Severus draw from rhetoric? In the field of invention, there is a large reserve of historical examples; in the field of style, it is the exploitation of contrast and variation. Above all, there is the principle of *amplificatio*, which influences both invention and disposition.

How about brilliance as a hallmark of poetry? Light and darkness can be produced in two different ways; directly, by adjectives and nouns of praise or blame or indirectly, by placing words in significant positions. The latter is especially complicated in poetry since there is an interplay between sentence structure and metre, and it is in this area, in fact, that we can best measure some of Severus' poetic achievements. In many Roman authors, poetry and rhetoric can hardly be separated. Even though in Augustan times the brilliant and short metaphors and metonymies describing Cicero's role in Roman society were very probably thought to be poetic, soon after, through the schools of declamation, this type of expression invaded and flooded oratory so that ultimately it was labelled rhetorical. When studying the history of Roman literature we have to keep in mind that the so-called intrusion of rhetoric into poetry, which is often said to have started with Ovid, should rather be reconsidered and redefined starting from the intrusion of poetry into rhetoric, which took place in the schools of declamation under Augustus. While some Augustan poets would have readily agreed that their powers of invention (*nerui*) were greatly enhanced by rhetoric, in the field of elocution the brilliant metaphors and metonymies were, in the eyes of the Augustans, not a gift of rhetoric to poetry, but of poetry to rhetoric.

On the more abstract level of "conflicting systems", Severus insists on the fact that the generally valid anthropological pattern is turned upside down: the head and the hands are trampled with feet. Antony not only violates human dignity; he also infringes upon the code of behaviour among fellow citizens by applying martial law against

Cicero, to be more precise, a type of martial law which the Romans had not enacted even against their worst enemies. It is evident that the author explicitly confronts different codes of behaviour with each other in order to evince Antony's total lack of humanity. The clash of codes is not only implied; it is developed by way of a rhetorical syncrisis.[1]

---

[1] Syncrisis is a method of teaching by comparing; it includes a comparison of contrary things and diverse persons in one sentence or paragraph.

CHAPTER NINE

LUCAN

The Revival of Epic Through Science and Rhetoric

Natura facit poetam, philologia hodierna dissoluit.[1] This dictum of a commentator of Lucan, C.M.Francken, sounds almost as pessimistic as the remark of Friedrich Schlegel who compared philological notes on poetry with anatomical lectures on a piece of roast meat.[2] If in the following lines we compare the poet Lucan with the tradition of epic, the danger of "dissecting" the poet is especially great. Given the all too wide range of the classical notion of *imitatio*, C.M.Francken made a step in the right direction by distinguishing between "sources" and "models".[3] This distinction is useful, although the influence of "sources" may extend even to structure and ideas. In the case of epic, generic traditions are predominantly embodied in great individuals. It is advisable, therefore, to consider the influence of Homer, Ennius, Virgil, and Ovid separately, although we should not forget that, for Lucan, intertextual relationships are not an aim in themselves; they form a part of the poet's "language" in his dialogue with his reader.

Generic traditions are especially strict in epic, and Lucan is known to have been the one who most violently infringed upon the laws of the genre, as was noticed by his contemporary Petronius.[4] Lucan, by

---

[1] C.M.Francken, "Parerga III", *Mnemosyne* n.s. 22 (1894): 162. The present chapter is based on my article "Der Dichter Lucan und die epische Tradition", *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* (Fondation Hardt) 15 (Vandœuvres-Genève, 1970): 279-308. More recent information in: M.von Albrecht, *A History of Roman Literature* (Leiden, 1997): 913-932; W.Rutz, re-ed. by Andreas W.Schmitt (quoted below, n. 5, pp. 228-229); Manfred G.Schmidt, *Caesar und Cleopatra. Philologischer und historischer Kommentar zu Lucan. 10. 1-171* (Frankfurt, 1986 = *Studien zur Klassischen Philologie* 25); Andreas W.Schmitt, *Die direkten Reden der Massen in Lucans Pharsalia* (Frankfurt, 1995 = *Studien zur Klassischen Philologie* 95).

[2] F.Schlegel, "Fragmente", *Athenäum* 1.2 (Berlin, 1798): 12; *Kritische F.-Schlegel-Ausgabe*, ed. by E.Behler and others, vol. 2 (= *Charakteristiken und Kritiken I*, ed. by H.Eichner, München, 1967): 171.

[3] Francken ibid., unlike C.Hosius, "Lucan und seine Quellen", *RhM*, n.s. 48 (1893): 380-397.

[4] Petron. 118.6; cf. A.Collignon, *Etude sur Pétrone. La critique littéraire, l'imitation et la parodie dans le Satiricon* (Paris, 1892); E.Courtney, "Parody and Literary Allusion in Menippean Satire", *Philologus* 106 (1962): 86-100; F.T.Baldwin, *The Bellum Civile of*

eschewing the so-called divine machinery, gave offence to the classical definition of epic, expressly requiring divine action.[1] Ancient scholars considered him an historian rather than a poet,[2] and Quintilian thought that as a model he was more suitable for orators than for poets.[3] Even in terms of poetic theory our subject ("Lucan as a poet") is fraught with more problems than it would be with other epic poets.

The theoretical aspects of our problem have been illuminated by P.Grimal.[4] Our approach to our subject is based on Lucan's poetic practice. Since we shall limit ourselves to his relationship to the tradition of epic, the following lines in many respects may serve as a "negative" test dismantling some wrong expectations of modern readers.

In terms of poetic practice, we may consider "epic tradition" the whole of epic poetry written before a given moment, including the structural principles and guiding ideas embodied in the earlier works. We will concentrate here on Lucan's relationship to individual epic poets; it would be a different task to analyse individual scenes[5] in

---

Petronius (New York, 1911); E.M.Sanford, "Lucan and His Roman Critics", *CPh* 26 (1931): 233-257; H.Stubbe, *Die Verseinlagen im Petron. Eingeleitet und erklärt* (Leipzig, 1933 = *Philologus*, Suppl. 25.2); R.Häußler, *Das historische Epos von Lucan bis Silius und seine Theorie. Zweiter Teil* (Heidelberg, 1978), esp. 106-147; G.B.Conte, *La guerra civile di Lucano. Studi e prove di commento* (Urbino, 1988).

[1] Petron., ibid: *Non enim res gestae uersibus comprehendae sunt, quod longe melius historici faciunt, sed per ambages deorumque ministeria ... praecipitandus est liber spiritus.* Cf. Theophrastus apud Suetonius, p. 17 in the edition by A.Reifferscheid (Leipzig, 1860) with the important explanation on p. 379. Diom., *Gramm.* I, 483-484 (K.): ἔπος ἐστὶ περιοχὴ θείων τε καὶ ἡρωικῶν πραγμάτων. *Epos dicitur graece carmine hexametro diuinarum rerum et heroicarum humanarumque comprehensio.* Poseidonius apud Diog. Laert. 7.60: ποίησις δέ ἐστι σημαντικὸν ποίημα, μίμησιν περιέχον θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπείων. Serv., *Aen.* 1, p. 4 (Th.): *Est autem heroicum quod constat ex diuinis humanisque personis, continens uera cum fictis.*

[2] Serv. *Aen.* 1. 382: *Lucanus ideo in numero poetarum esse non meruit* (cf. Martial 14. 194), *quia uidetur historiam composuisse, non poema* (cf. Isid. *Orig.* 8. 7. 10). Ancient critiques found evidence of *historicus character* in abrupt transitions; rich material from Servius in J.Ziehen, "Lucan als Historiker", *Berichte des Freien Deutschen Hochstiftes* (Frankfurt, 1890), fasc. 1, Abteilung für Sprachwissenschaft, a) Sektion für alte Sprachen, pp. 50-71. In historical epics, Aristotle (*Poet.* 23. 1459a-b) found no unity of action or thought (the existence of one central character is no sufficient guarantee of unity). In his paper P.Grimal has shown that in this respect Lucan did not intend to compose a "cyclic" but a "Homeric" epic which would meet the true intentions behind the Peripatetic requirements.

[3] Quint., *Inst.* 10. 1. 90: *Lucanus ardens et concitatus et sententiis clarissimus et, ut dicam quod sentio, magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus.* On this, cf. E.M.Sanford, *loc. cit.*

[4] P.Grimal, "Le poète et l'histoire", in: *Lucain. Sept exposés suivis de discussions*, ed. by M.Durry (Vandœuvres-Genève, 1968 = *Entretiens*, Fondation Hardt 15): 51-117.

[5] Excellent observations in W.Rutz, *Studien zur Kompositionskunst und zur epischen*

order to evince Lucan's specific modifications of individual traditional forms. We will focus our attention on the distinguishing features of Lucan rather than of those of his predecessors; the latter will be discussed only as far as such a discussion contributes to illustrate Lucan's poetic achievement.

In Lucan's work we hope to find some evidence for our supposition that the poet, without literally adhering to the standard definitions of epic, had nevertheless a perfect grasp[1] of their basic implications and succeeded in writing a "cosmic poetry". It is, therefore, the *poetic*[2] dimension in which the historical, rhetorical, and intertextual components have to be interpreted.

Lucan and Homer

When studying Lucan's relationship to Homer[3] we have to take into account the degree to which Homer in his work is obscured by the Latin tradition. A look at the ties between myth and history will allow us to give a new assessment of the relative importance of Homer for Lucan.

1. Lucan himself links his epic to Homer's in the scene at Troy in Book 9 (980-986). At the moment when Caesar promises to the gods of Troy to restore their city (999), he puts his own work on a par with the *Iliad.* It would be premature, of course, to conclude from this passage that Lucan was a fervent follower of Homer, especially since

---

Technik Lucans (diss. Kiel, 1950); new edition (with a bibliographical epilogue) by Andreas W.Schmitt (Frankfurt, 1989 = *Studien zur Klassischen Philologie* 42): esp. 110-115; H.P.Syndikus, *Lucans Gedicht vom Bürgerkrieg* (diss. München, 1958). On the storm scenes M.P.O.Morford, *The Poet Lucan* (Oxford, 1967): 20-58. Cf. also U.Piacentini, *Osservazioni sulla tecnica epica di Lucano* (Berlin, 1963 = *Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft* 39).

[1] Such was, for example, Silius' view of Homer's achievement: *Carmine complexus terram mare sidera manes* (13. 788).

[2] This implies, of course, the ancient notion of poetry, see for instance E.Lledó Íñigo, *El concepto "Poíesis" en la filosofía griega* (Madrid, 1961); N.A.Greenberg, "The Use of Poiema and Poiesis", *HSPh* 55 (1961): 263-289; G.Lieberg, "Ποιεῖν nel senso di poetare" in: *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata* ed. by L.Belloni and others, vol. 1 (Milano, 1995): 63-82.

[3] On Lucan and Homer: M.Lausberg, "Lucan und Homer", *ANRW* 2. 32. 3 (1985): 1565-1622; M.Lausberg, "Epos und Lehrgedicht: ein Gattungsvergleich am Beispiel von Lucans Schlangenkatalog", *WJA* 14 (1990): 173-203; W.D.Lebek, *Lucans Pharsalia. Dichtungsstruktur und Zeitbezug* (Göttingen 1976 = *Hypomnemata* 44): esp. index 297 s.v. *Ilias*; R.Häussler, *Das historische Epos von Lucan bis Silius und seine Theorie. Studien zum historischen Epos der Antike, II: Geschichtliche Epik nach Vergil* (Heidelberg, 1978 = *Bibl. der klass. Altertumswissenschaft*, n.s., 2, 60): esp. 75, n. 22; 67, n.127; 105.

the latter appears in this context not as a model, but as a symbol of the epic poet and his power to immortalize. Moreover, in this scene Caesar establishes a connection between Troy and Rome, a connection more reminiscent of Virgil than of Homer.[1] This is not owing to mere chance; as W.Rutz[2] observed, Roman influences are more relevant to Lucan than Greek influences.

In fact, scholars have duly stressed those features which separate Lucan from Homer. Consider, especially, his epic technique: there is less continuity in his narrative and less objectivity in his descriptions; subjective and emotional elements come to the fore; and individual scenes gain an importance of their own. From this point of view, it appears that Lucan one-sidedly developed certain Virgilian features to become what might be called the very antipode to Homer.[3] Is this gulf between Lucan and Homer owing to lack of information or does it reflect a deliberately critical approach? Given Homer's role in classical education, the first answer does not make sense. Pichon's somewhat simplistic rule that Lucan used Greek literature only through Roman intermediaries cannot apply to Homer; actually, as early as in Lucan's proem antithetic references to Homer are found.[4]

2. Along with this formal aspect, which is too well-known to be expounded here at length, we should consider two features of the *Pharsalia*'s content which seem to have received less attention from scholars. First, as an historical poet, Lucan is different from both Homer and Virgil who focused their attention on myth. This fact enables him to outshine Homer's myth by the facts of Roman history. Thus, in Book 6 (48-60) a wall built by Caesar is compared with the ramparts of Troy made by the gods, very much to the latters' disadvantage.[5] Anything we might have heard of former walls, whether

---

[1] Lucan is not anti-Virgilian to the point of completely disclaiming the *Aeneid:* he is fully aware of the roots of Caesarism in the Roman past (cf. also Grimal's interpretation of Caesar's prayer in Book 1 [P.Grimal, "Le poète et l'histoire", in: *Entretiens Fondation Hardt* 15 (Vandœuvres-Genève, 1968) 51-106, especially 56-69]), although in Lucan, on the whole, the impression prevails that the rise of Caesar and of his empire was dearly paid for with the fall of Republican Rome. As Grimal has shown, Lucan's hopes were actually not directed towards a restoration of the Republic, but towards the creation of a good monarchy; this explains several passages of the *Pharsalia,* which otherwise would remain isolated.

[2] W.Rutz (quoted above, n. 5, pp. 228-229): 87, relying on: R.Pichon, *Les sources de Lucain* (Paris, 1912) 217 (I cannot accept Pichon's exaggerated statement).

[3] Cf. K.Seitz, "Der pathetische Erzählstil Lucans", *Hermes* 93 (1965): 204-232. Scholars often exaggerate Lucan's political bias.

[4] G.B.Conte, "Il proemio della *Pharsalia*", *Maia* n.s. 18 (1966): 42-53.

[5] Cf. also Virgil, *Aen.* 9. 144-145.

mythical or historical, is eclipsed by Caesar's wall. First of all, this is true in terms of quantity (in fact, the Neronian age had developed a special taste for gigantic dimensions). In the second place we should take into account that the Roman public preferred things seen to things merely heard. The latter idea was frequently expressed by Statius in his *Siluae.*[1] But as early as Augustus Roman poets fully recognized that the "god" Augustus, who exerted a visible impact on history, had a higher degree of reality than the gods and heroes of mythology. Caesar cut down the trees of the sacred grove at Massilia, but unlike his mythical prototype Erysichthon he was not punished by the gods: Lucan gives his readers a symbolical picture of a new stage in the history of ideas.[2] In a Roman's view history was more important than myth: "La guerre de Troie était un jeu d'enfants en comparaison des guerres civiles de Rome" (Voltaire).[3]

3. Our third point is perhaps surprising; it is, however, the most important one: in several respects Lucan is, in fact, closer to Homer than to Virgil. Let us start with some rather obvious observations.

We find not only phrases borrowed directly from Homer (without consulting Virgil),[4] but also entire scenes. In Book 9 Cato's speech restores the morale of the troops and prevents the tired soldiers from sailing home, as a speech of Ulysses had done in the 2nd Book of the *Iliad.* The "typological" relationship between Cato and Ulysses definitely bears an ethical stamp. All of this is redolent of moralizing interpretations of Homer according to which Ulysses was frequently considered a prefiguration of the Stoic sage. Lucan, who must have heard such interpretations in his schooldays,[5] takes this Stoic view of Ulysses as the basis for transferring onto Cato a scene in which Ulysses was involved. He gives a new turn to other Homeric elements as well by using them to convey his own poetic intentions to his readers. In

---

[1] Cf. H.Cancik, Untersuchungen zur lyrischen Kunst des P.Papinius Statius (Hildesheim, 1965 = Spudasmata vol. 13).

[2] The soldiers obey Caesar because they counterbalance the power of Caesar's anger against that of divine wrath.

[3] Voltaire, *Essai sur la poésie épique,* ch. 4; cf. Pierre Schmid, "Quelques jugements sur la *Pharsale*", *EL*, sér. 2, vol. 8 (1965): 254.

[4] F.Caspari, De ratione quae inter Vergilium et Lucanum intercedat quaestiones selectae (diss. Leipzig, 1908): 12 (with bibl.). For recent studies on Lucan and Homer s. above, n. 3, p. 229.

[5] Cf. my article "Allegorie", in: *Lexikon der Alten Welt* (Zürich, 1965): 121-123. On Pompey and Ulysses cf. the discussion in: *Lucain. Sept exposés suivis de discussions par* B.M.Marti (and others), préparés et présidés par M.Durry (Vandœuvres-Genève, 1968, publ. 1970): esp. 307-308.

the *Notturno*[1] of Book 2 the author's moral concern helps to transform the *Dolonia* well-nigh into another "Dialogue with Nicodemus". In Book 7 the basic theme of imminent destruction—*ueluti uenientia fata, non transmissa, legent* (7. 212-213)—is justly reminiscent of Homer's ἔσσεται ἦμαρ.[2] The dying Domitius who announces Caesar's death evokes a corresponding scene between Hector and Achilles.[3] The parallel between Caesar and Achilles, which was fostered by the ideology of Alexander, is strongly felt in the simile of the unlucky star.[4] Even more important is the incorporation of the future into the present, which is a Homeric device. Generally speaking, Lucan's tragic view of history recalls Homer, who may be rightly considered the father of tragedy. Just as for Hector there was no real hope, so for Pompey, who in this respect is the antipode of Aeneas.

Hence, Pompey is allowed to express his preoccupation no less passionately than Priam had[5] whereas Latinus' complaint in Virgil was more restrained and closer to "classical" standards. The fact that Lucan and Homer give greater importance to hideous and pitiful features than Virgil does is one of several points of contact between rhapsodic and rhetorical poets; another is their readiness to achieve momentary effects at the cost of contradictions with other parts of their works.

Last but not least, there is the universal range of their poetry. Even in terms of quantity there is more geographical information in Lucan and Homer than in Virgil. For all their differences in cultural background this parallel is telling, based as it is on their attitude to historical reality: both Lucan and the Homeric bard are personally convinced that they are describing real historical events. It is only in retrospect that Homer's epic seems to be "mythological"; to the Homeric poet myth *is* history. If we consider the poets' views of their

---

1 On scenes staged by night: A.Eichberger, *Untersuchungen zu Lucan. Der Nilabschnitt im 10. Buch des Bellum civile* (diss. Tübingen, 1935): 66-67.

2 Lucan 7. 131; cf. 195; Virgil, *Aeneid* 2. 324; 7. 145; Homer, *Iliad* 4. 164-165.

3 Lucan 7. 608-616; Homer, *Iliad* 22. 356-360. The death of Achilles would not be narrated in the *Iliad*; it is not unlikely that the same would have been true for Caesar's death in Lucan.

4 In Book 10 Alexander is compared with an unlucky star (*sidus iniquum gentibus* 10. 35-36); in 10. 89-90 Cleopatra calls Caesar *gentibus aequum sidus*. Both passages are clearly related to each other; behind Caesar there is Alexander, and behind both of them is Achilles who before his combat with Hector was compared with an unlucky star (*Iliad* 22. 25-32). A prefiguration of Cleopatra is Helen (cf. Euripides, *Orestes* 128-129 and Virgil, *Aeneid* 2. 573); see R.Goossens, *Latomus* 5 (1946): esp. 277-278 and R.T.Bruère, *CPh* 59 (1964): 267.

5 *Iliad* 22. 33-78.

activities, surprisingly Virgil is the only one in this series to create consciously a myth and limit history to prophetic insertions. Both Lucan and Homer chose a subject matter close to history and adopted the world views of their own times whereas Virgil under the unusual conditions of his age and of his genius looked beyond his own days, incorporating historical facts into a myth which was not taken for granted naively, but created through intellectual effort.

Lucan and Ennius

We will discuss Lucan's relationship to Ennius under three aspects: first, the problem of direct influence, second, Zielinski's "Law of Incompatibility", third, the problem of coherence and unity in the epics of Ennius and Lucan.

1. Although in some instances we are in a position to compare Lucan with Ennius,[1] the problem remains, whether there is direct or

---

[1] On Lucan and Ennius: Caspari (quoted above, n. 4, p. 231): 12-13; W.E.Heitland, Introduction to: *M.Annaei Lucani Pharsalia. Edited with English Notes by C.E.Haskins* (London 1887): p. cxxviii; F.Skutsch, *Pauly-Wissowa* 5. 2, 2617; C.Hosius, *De imitatione scriptorum Romanorum imprimis Lucani* (Festschrift Univ. Greifswald 1907), esp. on 1. 145. Vahlen does not mention Lucan in his "Praefatio"; Otto Skutsch, *The Annals of Q.Ennius. Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford, 1985), mentions Lucan on p. 399 ("Lucan is the first writer after Ennius to use *spiramen.* Twice he has it in precisely the same sense, 6. 90-91; 10. 247-248. In the third passage, the earliest, 2. 183 *alius spiramina naris aduncae amputat,* it looks as though we had an echo of the Ennian line": Lucan seems to have understood Ennius' pun *Naris - naris*); 391: in 3. 539 Lucan uses the Ennian word *tonsis* as an alternative to *remus*; Skutsch does not accept Conte's view and slightly doubts direct Ennian influence in this passage; on p.16 Skutsch gives a fuller discussion: "Lucan, nephew of Ennius' fiercest critic, Seneca, can hardly be expected to be strongly influenced by Ennius. The only reasonably certain instance was pointed out by the *Commentum Bernense*: 1. 6-7 is apparently indebted to *Ann.* 582. G.B.Conte, "Ennio e Lucano", *Maia* 22 (1970): 132-138 compares 3. 538-43 with *Ann.* 218-9; but see the commentary there. F.Skutsch 2617 stated that the fight of Scaeva, 6. 192-262, was based not only on that of Turnus (*Aen.* 9. 806-818), but also on that of the tribune [*Ann.* XV v], a point made in greater detail by Conte, *loc.cit.*, comparing 192 *crebris sonat ictibus umbo* with *Ann.* 392 *tinnit hastilibus umbo.* It is true that Virgil's *strepit ... galea... nec sufficit umbo ictibus* [808-11] is not very different and that the greater closeness of Lucan to Ennius could be accidental. However, if it is correctly deduced from the coincidence of Lucilius 1323 and Lucan 6. 164 [see on *Vest.* viii] that *uicimus o socii* occurred in the *Annals*, that shout of triumph might belong to the ἀριστεία of the tribune, as in Lucan it belongs to that of Scaeva. If so, it would strengthen the view that Lucan followed not only Virgil, but also Ennius. If with his *ciuis qui fugerit esto* [7. 319] Lucan was inverting the *cohortatio communis imperatoria* [Cic. *Balb.* 51] '*hostem qui feriet*', he did not necessarily have Ennius in mind, or, if he did, he could have remembered the quotation from Cicero."; 408 n.18 (the alleged fragment of Lucan [12 M.] belongs to Walter of Châtillon, *Alexandreis* 1. 14 [W.D.Lebek, *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* (1980): 103; differently N.Horsfall, *CJ* 76 (1981): 298-300; 560

indirect influence. To give an example, the situation of Scaeva in Book 6 is comparable to similar scenes in Homer, Ennius, and Virgil. If we eliminate the elements which Lucan could have taken from Virgil, there remains hardly any hint of direct Ennian influence.[1] It is tempting to assume an influence of Ennius' Hannibal on Lucan's Caesar (cf. 1. 304; 183; 2. 45), but between them are still Virgil's Turnus, Livy's Hannibal, and the rhetorical *exempla*. Is there anything left which could be identified as undeniably Ennian? In other cases the following argument is possible: supposing that an Ennian passage is known to us from Cicero, how can it be proved that Lucan's source was not Cicero as well? It is much easier, therefore, to maintain that Lucan did not use Ennius directly than to prove the contrary, and we should keep in mind that our evidence does not allow definite conclusions.

Even if F.Leo was right in assuming that Ennius was unknown to the generation of Lucan, it is still necessary to study the problem of indirect influences. In this case Ennius' contribution to our knowledge of Lucan would be of less consequence than that of Lucan to our knowledge of Ennius. To give an example, C.Hosius[2] claimed that the phrase *uincere bello* (Lucan, 1. 145; 366) was Ennian (because it was imitated likewise by Lucilius 450 Marx). A similar inference could perhaps be made concerning the elephant simile (6. 208-213), all the more as Rabirius *Frg.* 3 Morel offers a parallel which is often neglected.[3] There seems to be an attractive field of research

(on the Ennian passage *aerato sonitu galeae* "all difficulty could be resolved by assuming the loss of a line [Vahlen], a suggestion taken up and made very probable by G.B.Conte, *Maia* 22 (1970): 137-138, comparing Homer's ..., Virgil's ... as well as Lucan 6. 192-262. ... other possibilities, however, remain ... *aera sonunt* ... seems quite probable."; 415 ("A subtle and perversely ingenious echo, if not of Ennius himself, at any rate of the topic, is found in Lucan 7. 319 *ciuis qui fugerit esto*, where *fugerit* has replaced the opposite notion"). I am pleased that Skutsch shares my skepticism concerning direct Ennian influence on Lucan.

1 O.Skutsch, *The Annals of Q.Ennius* (Oxford, 1985): 16-17 and 560 fully confirms this view. The passages are: Homer, *Iliad* 16. 102-111; Virgil, *Aeneid* 9. 803-811; Lucan, 6. 133-137; 192-195. If we omit words mediated by Virgil, there remain the following words, which have an Ennian ring: *nimbus* (134), *quassae* (136), *nec quicquam* (194); cf. also *frangit* (210); but all these parallels are too imprecise to allow any conclusions.

2 *De imitatione* ... on Lucan 1. 145.

3 Servius attests that Virgil in his ants simile (*Aeneid* 4. 404) made use of an Ennian hemistich which referred to elephants, whereas Accius had applied the same words to Indians. Being a Roman poet, Lucan chose for his simile a more dignified animal than Homer's donkey (*Iliad* 11. 557); being a Neronian, he chose a bigger animal than Virgil's lion (*Aeneid* 9. 792). Lucan was not the first to use the elephant simile (as is shown from the Rabirius passage). It would be rather surpris-

which, however, we should be wise enough to leave to Ennian scholars.

2. More relevant to Lucan is the problem of narrative technique. As Krókowski[1] has shown, Lucan adheres less than the other epic poets to the "law of incompatibility" discovered by Zielinski.[2] To describe two parallel actions, Homer[3] has to turn *Action I* into a state of rest or equable motion, and only then can *Action II* begin. Likewise, the narrator returns to *Action I* only when *Action II* has turned into such a state. Epic poets thereby strive for a maximum of continuity without chronological overlaps or flashbacks. While Lucan[4] in his transitions sometimes follows this epic tradition, sometimes he picks up the story at an earlier point and thus presents parallel actions one after another, a narrative technique closer to the style of history than to that of epic. Of course, Lucan exploited the historians not only as sources, but also as models, and in so doing followed in the footsteps of his epic predecessor Ennius. In all probability, however, Ennius' influence was only indirect and mediated through the *Aeneid*.[5]

3. The inner unity and coherence of an epic poem may manifest itself in both form and content or only in its ideological background; the latter is the case in Ennius. Insistence on ideology enhances the impact of rhetoric on epic, as can be seen in Ennius and Lucan. The values of the Roman *res publica* are prominent, as is the influence of panegyric and invective, although Lucan's "bias" has often been exaggerated.

No doubt, Ennius did not give his work a strict formal unity in the Aristotelian sense of the word. He appropiated all the colours of Homer's bright palette, but he did not yet master the overall structural design discovered in the *Iliad* by its Hellenistic interpreters. Thus Ennius remains a "cyclic" poet, whereas Lucan intended to write an

---

ing if elephants, which played such an important role in the wars against Pyrrhus and Hannibal, should have been introduced into the epic simile only by Rabirius. In J.Garuti's edition of Rabirius (Studi pubbl. dall'Istituto di Filol. Classica 5, Bologna 1958) our fragment is missing; Heitland (quoted above, n. 1, pp. 233-234): cxxviii noted the parallel.

1 G.Krókowski, *Quaestiones epicae* (Wrocław, 1951): 71-76.

2 T.Zielinski, "Die Behandlung gleichzeitiger Ereignisse im antiken Epos I", *Philologus* suppl. 8. 3 (1901): 407-449.

3 The same law is strictly observed by Apollonius Rhodius as well (Krókowski, 54-58).

4 Preceded in several instances by Virgil (Krókowski, 41-70).

5 Ancient critics observed an *historicus character* at some transitional points in the *Aeneid*, cf. J.Ziehen and G.Krókowski (quoted above, n. 1).

epic perfectly meeting Homeric and Virgilian standards.[1] Even in this crucial point there is the towering figure of Virgil between Ennius and Lucan.

Lucan and Virgil

We shall limit our discussion of Lucan's relationship to Virgil to two basic problems: first, Lucan as an "anti-Virgil"[2] or as an "ultra-Virgil" and, second, the development of the subjective element in epic from Virgil to Lucan.

1. It was not Lucan's intention to create a myth which justified history. In a formal epic competing with Virgil, he wanted to describe and explain an historical reality, the greatness of which would outshine any myth. This implies the double claim of the *Pharsalia* to be both an "anti-*Aeneid*" and an "ultra-*Aeneid*". The term "anti-Virgil", however, covers only one side of the problem of Lucan's relationship to his greatest Roman predecessor. Let us give some illustrations of both these tendencies. F.Caspari[3] rightly emphasized that Lucan displays his independence by deliberately avoiding literal Virgilian reminiscences. But this correct observation led him to the wrong conclusion that Virgil actually was not very important to Lucan.[4] The reader of Lucan should keep in mind that, in the schools of rhetoric, students were taught to avoid literal borrowings from their models[5] and that free paraphrase was an art orators were proud of. Nevertheless, even direct Virgilian reminiscences[6] are frequent enough in Lucan to challenge Caspari's view.

---

[1] Cf. also the contributions of B.M.Marti and P.Grimal to the Lucan Entretiens (Vandœuvres-Genève, 1968): 3-50; 53-117.

[2] Cf. A.Thierfelder, "Der Dichter Lucan", *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 25 (1935): 1-20, esp. 14.

[3] *De ratione, quae inter Lucanum et Vergilium intercedat* (diss. Leipzig, 1908/9): esp. 94.

[4] Of course, he cannot deny the influence of Virgil's language. Important R.Pichon, *Les sources de Lucain* (Paris, 1912): 217-229. See now: L.Thompson and R.T.Bruère, "Lucan's Use of Virgilian Reminiscence", *CPh* 63 (1968): 1-21 (sometimes somewhat strained). A sober and convincing discussion of parallel scenes in W.Rutz (*passim*), with special regard to "epic technique".

[5] To give an example, an evident allusion without copying a single word is found in 4. 96: *lucri pallida tabes* (cf. *Aeneid* 3. 57: *auri sacra fames*).

[6] E.g., *faces et saxa uolant* (7. 512), literally from *Aeneid* 1. 150. The list of Virgilian imitations in W.E.Heitland (preface to: *M.Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*, Edited with English Notes by C.E.Haskins [London 1887]), pp. cx-cxxvi, is useful but somewhat indiscriminate; cf. also R.B.Steele, "Lucan's *Pharsalia*", *AJPh* 45 (1924): 301-328, section I ("Adapted Material").

To begin with, let us consider the overall structure. A division of an entire work into tetrads (i.e. groups of four books) has been observed both in the *Pharsalia* and the *Aeneid*. Moreover, in both of these epics the contact with the other world occurs in Book 6,[1] the great battle begins in Book 7 and there is a flashback to earlier events in Book 2. We might add a less known parallel: in Book 4 there is a fraternization of two inimical parties, which ultimately aggravates the conflict.

Besides these general similarities of structure[2] there are also parallels of detail which are relevant to the meaning of the *Pharsalia*.[3]

A.Guillemin[4] used Lucan's reversal of the motifs of the Latin towns (*Aeneid* 6. 773-776; Lucan 7. 391-396) and of the revolutionaries in the other world (*Aeneid* 8. 666-667; Lucan 6. 793-794) to demonstrate that Lucan by his description of destruction deliberately created an antithesis to Virgil's myth of Rome's birth. This is an important point to which two complements may be made:

a) In Book 7 there is not only "imitation by contrast", but Lucan also adapts Virgilian descriptions of destruction[5] in the same sense and tries to surpass them.

b) Examples of Virgilian imitation which are relevant to the meaning of the *Pharsalia* are found not only in Book 7 and certain parts of Book 6 (as A.Guillemin thought), but elsewhere in Lucan, too.

A. The 2nd Book of the *Aeneid* (which is on the destruction of Troy) is a meaningful background to Book 7 of the *Pharsalia*. "The very last, the decisive day has come" *uenit summa dies* (*Aeneid* 2. 324; Lucan 7. 195). This quotation from the 2nd Book of the *Aeneid* no longer pertains to Troy alone, but to the Roman world as a whole.

---

1 M.P.O.Morford, *The Poet Lucan* (Oxford, 1967) 68, rightly notes that the position of Lucan's necromancy is Virgilian while its content is influenced by Ovid and Seneca.

2 Independently of the problem of how many books Lucan intended to write, the connection of certain scenes with certain book numbers is telling: to give an example, Silius, *Punica* 2 is reminiscent of *Aeneid* 2, and the beginning of Silius, *Punica* 3 evokes the first line of *Aeneid* 3, and yet Silius did not write twelve books, but seventeen.

3 Details in R.Pichon, *Les sources de Lucain* (Paris, 1912): 218-220; E.Malcovati, *M.Anneo Lucano* (Milano, 1940): 100-104.

4 "L'inspiration virgilienne dans la Pharsale", *REL* 29 (1951): 214-227. An example of imitation by contrast is Lucan's reinterpretation of *aduenisse diem* (*Aeneid* 7. 145; Lucan 7. 131).

5 Guillemin's refers to *Aeneid* 2 only in general terms.

Lucan's Pompey[1] becomes a magnified projection of Latinus' powerless majesty (*Aeneid* 7). The prodigious Mars simile is transferred from Turnus onto Caesar in an augmented form (*Aeneid* 12. 331-340; Lucan 7. 567-572). Lucan's Pompey in Book 7 realizes that the gods are against him,[2] as Turnus does in *Aeneid* 12. Pale as death, the faces of Pompey's soldiers before the battle are reminiscent of Turnus' death-like pallor when he walked towards the altar in the manner of a victim.[3] In his sophisticated art of foreshadowing (cf. 7. 212-213), Lucan also does not disdain Virgilian technique.

Guillemin's observations concerning "imitation by contrast", therefore, can be supplemented with "affirmative" imitations, especially of Books 2, 7, and 12 of the *Aeneid*. Here allusion to individual Virgilian characters is less important than the intention to indicate the range of the events described and, if possible, to surpass Virgil.

B. A further complement to Guillemin, who limited her observations to Books 7 and 6, can be drawn from the rest of the *Pharsalia*.

Let us start with Book 1. Although it is true that Lucan's proem is based on prefaces of historical works,[4] on closer inspection it turns out to be, structurally speaking, an enlarged version of the proem of the *Aeneid*.[5] In the latter, the subjects are arranged as follows:

a) announcement of subject matter (*Aeneid* 1. 1-7),
b) invocation of the Muse (*Aeneid* 1. 8-11),
c) exposition of the *causae* (*Aeneid* 1. 12-33).

Lucan's arrangement is similar:

a) announcement of subject matter (1-7 with supplementary considerations 8-32),
b) Nero as the inspiring deity instead of the Muse (33-66),
c) exposition of the *causae* (67-182).

The Virgilian framework is filled up with different elements. The announcement of the theme proper has seven lines as in the *Aeneid* (and in the *Iliad*). It is followed, however, by a rhetorical meditation,[6]

---

1 Against their better judgement both let disaster take its course; Lucan gives the storm imagery more prominence (*Aeneid* 7. 594; Lucan 7. 123-127).

2 *Aeneid* 12. 895; Lucan 7. 85-86. Cf. also Lucan 7. 88: *nil ultra fata morabor* with *Aeneid* 12. 11: *nulla mora in Turno*.

3 *Aeneid* 12. 219-221; Lucan 7. 130. A more remote parallel is *Aeneid* 4. 644.

4 M.Pohlenz, "Causae civilium armorum", *Epitymbion H.Swoboda dargebracht* (Reichenberg, 1927): 201-210.

5 Moreover, there are significant parallels to the proem of the *Georgics*, cf. E.Paratore, "Virgilio georgico e Lucano", *ASNP* 2/12 (1943): 40-69.

6 Cf., however, also *Georgics* 1. 5-23 (Virgil's invocation is replaced by an address).

introduced by an allusion to Homer's τίς τ' ἄρ σφῶε θεῶν. Then Lucan replaces the invocation of the Muse with an homage to the emperor as his divine inspirer, in the vein not of the *Aeneid*, but of the *Georgics* and Manilius.

The third part, which contains the exposition of the *causae*, starts with the words *fert animus* (an homage to Ovid, whose importance for Lucan we will discuss later). Next follow some "historical" elements (portraits of the main characters and a sketch of the historical situation), and, finally there is the theme of moral decline. All of this is not merely discussed as an abstract matter, but put before the reader's eyes by means of graphic similes. There is something more behind this manner of presentation than an orator's striving for ἐνάργεια; there is also the poet's aim of adding universal dimensions to his historical subject matter (witness the imagery of doomsday, of the Isthmus, of the venerable oak tree and the lightning). We will come back to these images later. For the moment it is enough to have shown how Lucan enriched a Virgilian form with elements from other sources.[1]

Lucan's proem is anti-Virgilian inasmuch as the theme announced in it is destruction, not construction (*Aeneid* 1. 33: "So massive a task it was to found the Roman race"[2] *tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem*). It is Lucan's declared aim to describe a suicidal conflict of a universal relevance and a cosmic significance which is sometimes overlooked. It is not his primary aim to denigrate Caesar or whitewash Pompey, but rather to describe the fatal situation of civil war in which the borderlines between right and wrong are blurred and even a moral authority like Cato is fully aware that neither party is free of guilt and that politically there is no hope left. "Which had the fairer pretext for warfare we may not know"[3] *quis iustius induit arma / scire nefas* (1. 126-127): this statement found in the 1st Book should be kept in mind. Lucan's heroes, especially Cato, who acts without any hope, are totally different from Aeneas, who even at the most difficult moments is sure of being guided by gods and can rely on their promises of a blissful future on earth. Lucan goes beyond Virgil by basing his ethics even less on the idea of temporal rewards.

---

[1] A similar principle is behind Lucan's blending of "classical" structure and "baroque" development, cf. the articles by B.M.Marti, W.Rutz, and P.Grimal in the Lucan Entretiens (quoted above, n. 4, p. 228), Vandœuvres-Genève 1968, esp. 50.

[2] Translation: C.Day Lewis (Oxford, 1952; paperback: New York, 1953).

[3] Translation: J.D.Duff (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1928, many reprints).

Lucan's heretical Virgilianism, partly contesting, partly outdoing his predecessor, is not limited to the introduction of his work. At the outset of the narrative, we find some features typical of the epic tradition, such as the choice of a symbolical starting point, the crossing of the Rubicon. Furthermore, the lion simile is an immediate reminiscence of the beginning of *Aeneid* 12 where Turnus is compared to a lion who develops his raving power to the full not until he has been wounded. Here Lucan (1. 205-212) keeps the Virgilian motif, but enhances the drama by splitting up the process into several stages:

1st: The lion descries his enemy.
2nd: He sits down and gathers all his power and ferocity;
3rd: He shows all external signs of anger;
4th: He is being injured;
5th: He rushes against the flying javelin, is pierced by it and leaves it behind.

The following elements are found in both authors:
1st: the motif,
2nd: its position in an initial scene;
3rd: its thematic function, i.e.
a) the description of an emotion as a driving force behind the action;
b) the preparation of a great battle;
4th: the foreshadowing of the hero's death.

Unlike Virgil, Lucan places his simile at the end, not at the beginning of a scene. In accordance with the course of the main action, Lucan's simile exhibits a more dramatic structure.[1] As the scene is crowned by the simile, the simile in its turn culminates in a pointed expression ("He passes on along the length of the weapon"[2] *per ferrum ... exit*). This simile portrays Caesar's anger (*ira*) as a motivating force which is more dangerous than the anger of Virgil's Turnus. Also in Lucan, the lion is wounded only at the last moment, and this gives greater prominence to the lion's maddening himself with a cruel lash of his tail. Keying oneself up with anger is a method alluded to by Virgil elsewhere (12. 108), and frequently found in Seneca's tragedies. As Caesar's *ira* outshines Turnus' anger,[3] the morale of the Caesarians

[1] Conformity with the main action is typical of Lucan's similes.
[2] Translation: J.D.Duff, quoted above, n. 3, p. 239.
[3] Cf. also the above mentioned Mars simile.

reflects Turnus' readiness to die, not without a touch of frivolity: "Is it so wretched a fate to be victorious in a civil war?" *usque adeo miserum est ciuili uincere bello?* (Lucan 1. 366; *Aeneid* 12. 646).

To sum up this paragraph:

a) Lucan's striving to outdo Virgil is no less important than "imitation by contrast";

b) Imitation of Virgil is not limited to Books 6 and 7 and no less essential to the content of the work in other books of Lucan.

What does Lucan have in mind when following Virgil? Analogies between individual characters seem to be less important than crucial themes such as:

a) the theme of destruction (*Aeneid* 2 and *Aeneid* 7-12);

b) the technique of foreshadowing (e.g. *Aeneid* 12);

c) the role of emotions as driving forces (*ira* and defiance of death: e.g. *Aeneid* 12).

Lucan's great independence and the fact that his allusions have rarely more than local importance show that his ultimate motivation was not some perverse intention to imitate Virgil, but the determination to develop his own themes. Epic tradition, of which Virgil is an integral part, had the function of supplying the appropriate language and imagery.

Lucan was not anti-Virgilian to the point of contesting the validity of the *Aeneid*, he presupposes its existence and deliberately attempts to create a companion piece to it which would form a contrast and outshine it. His use of Virgilian material is extremely free in detail; for his epic scenes he finds in Virgil hardly more than starting-points for both poetic development and moral interpretation.

2. It is worthwhile to dwell on an element which has Virgilian roots, but was further developed by Lucan: the loading of his narrative with all-pervasive emotion.[1] In the following paragraphs we will dwell less on Lucan's analysis of the emotions behind the action than on his emotional comments on the events. In this respect, from Virgil to Lucan a substantial change seems to have taken place which deserves our attention.

Lucan's address to his hero Scaeva (6. 257-262), viewed against the background of the epic tradition, is indicative of the development of the subjective element in epic from Homer through Virgil to Lucan. Even Homer had inserted some subjective considerations at the

---

[1] This important feature was duly stressed by Rutz, *passim*.

moment when Hector put on Achilles' weapons, which he had taken from Patroclus (*Iliad* 17. 201-208). But he lent some objectivity to these reflections by ascribing them to Zeus and by connecting them strictly with the action; thus, Zeus announces that, for the moment, Hector will be victorious. Similar remarks, though by the poets themselves, are found in Apollonius[1] and Virgil. The latter's addresses to Pallas (10. 507-509) and to Nisus and Euryalus (9. 446-449) strike a mournful note,[2] a note typical of Virgil, who refined the epic genre and introduced to it some "lyric" elements in the modern sense of the word.[3] One of the means to achieve this is a discriminate use of rhetorical apostrophe. Lucan, however, gives up Virgil's noble discretion as rhetoric becomes more prominent. It would be misleading, though, to dismiss Lucan's numerous personal interventions as mere "reasoning" and label them as prosaic and unpoetic inclusions.

It might be more promising to observe the development of this technique from Virgil to Lucan and then to try to grasp the differences between both poets. Since the contemplative passages in Lucan are, for the most part, passionate rather than rational, accordingly their language is highly emotional, revelling in interjections and exclamations. One could say that Lucan accompanies events with emotional comments in a way comparable to the function of arias and ariosos in baroque oratorios. The fact that the texts of Bach's or Handel's arias and ariosos are meditations accompanying a sacred story and are built on rhetorical principles shows that this parallel is more than a mere analogy. In the view of Bach's contemporaries, these texts belong to lyric. Under certain historical conditions, there is a close affinity between lyric and rhetoric.[4] Instead of rejecting Lucan's personal comments as an adventitious element alien to epic, we might therefore acknowledge it as a specific form of poetic discourse. Encouraged by some hints found in Virgil, Lucan moulds a

---

[1] Apollonius Rhodius 4. 445; R.Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik* (Leipzig, 1915, 3rd ed.): 370-373; in the *Ciris* (which is written in the Hellenistic style) and in Ovid such personal interventions are more frequent than in Virgil; cf. M.von Albrecht, *Die Parenthese in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihre dichterische Funktion* (= Spudasmata 7, Hildesheim, 1967): 189-194.

[2] As do Anchises' words to Marcellus (6. 882-883).

[3] On the musical element in the *Aeneid*, V.Pöschl, *Die Dichtkunst Virgils* (Innsbruck/Wien, 1950, 2nd ed. 1964; English ed. Ann Arbor, 1962) *passim.*

[4] Parallels between Lucan's personal comments and the choruses in Seneca's tragedies suggest the same conclusion (B.M.Marti in a dicussion following this paper).

personal and contemplative approach into lyric meditations built on rhetorical principles.

Yet, the result is quite different from Virgil. Scaeva's achievement does not find Lucan's unconditional acceptance; he admires it without approving it ultimately. Nor does he agree with the ways of fate, for he has lost Virgil's faith and hope. Neither Pompey, the venerable but powerless representative of the past, nor Caesar, the reckless champion of the future, gained Lucan's unreserved applause. Even in his lyric comments Lucan keeps his distance from his subject matter. He is not a faithful believer in an historical evolution towards a lofty goal, but a marvelling observer of the twilight of the gods and the end of the world; Lucan's civil war is, as it were, a reversal of the gigantomachy. Virgil's soft melancholy (more appealing to the modern reader than his Roman ideology) is outshone by Lucan's highly emotional awareness of a universal catastrophe. In this respect, once more, Lucan tries both to create a counterpart to the *Aeneid* and to outdo his predecessor. Lucan's exuberant "arias" replace the subtle lyric touch of Virgil with a more spectacular demeanour. This, however, does not obscure the common roots of both, even though lyric prevails in Virgil's "rhetoric", as does rhetoric in Lucan's "lyric".

Some parallel phenomena in Lucan might allow us to pinpoint the difference between the two poets more precisely. Lucan, for example, replaces the "mystic" initiation of Aeneas in the netherworld with Caesar's "scientific" initiation in Egypt, a passage in which A.Eichberger[1] discovered traces of the religious vocabulary of initiation from *Aeneid* 6. Another parallel is the increasing prominence of similes evoking the macrocosm in (Ovid and) Lucan; for example, Caesar is compared to the ocean, and civil war to doomsday.[2] Accordingly, in Lucan the lyric element is no longer mystic or introspective, but rhetorical and extraverted; indeed, it might even be called "ecstatic" in the literal sense of the word.[3]

---

1 A.Eichberger (quoted above, n. 1, p. 232): 9 (with bibl.): "What had been a mystery of faith, has become an achievement of reason."

2 Cf. e.g. L.Eckardt, *Exkurse und Ekphraseis bei Lucan* (diss. Heidelberg [1934] 1936): 48-50.

3 It is certainly more than mere chance that Hölderlin's lyric genius in his youth felt strongly attracted to Lucan. The decrease of interest in Lucan in the course of the 19th century may ultimately be rooted in a romantic preference for individual rather than universal issues in lyric poetry.

Lucan and Ovid

Hitherto we have not mentioned Virgil's *Georgics*, Lucretius, and Manilius. The influence of didactic poetry, which was considered to be part and parcel of epic poetry, is a corollary to the increasing role of natural science and philosophical ideas in Lucan. Eschewing the so-called divine machinery, he necessarily had to rely more on those poets who had viewed nature without the veil of mythology, the author of the *Georgics*[1] and, even more so, Lucretius[2] and the non-mythological passages in Books 1 and 15 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses.* Tellingly, Lucan refers to these predecessors regardless of their philosophical creed. For Lucretius, the *Georgics* and Manilius[3] we must limit ourselves to mere hints. As Morford puts it: "Lucretius first showed that it was possible to unite poetic imagery with scientific exposition; this is one of the distinguishing features of Lucan's stormwriting".[4]

Among Lucan's models Ovid plays an important role. Apart from his brilliant mastery of metre and his vivid imagination, which fascinated many young poets, it was especially the didactic passages in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* to which Lucan felt attracted (the same had been true for his uncle, Seneca the Younger). Strangely enough, however, scholars have paid too little heed to the influence of Ovid the natural philosopher.[5] We should not expand here on the numerous verbal reminiscences of Ovid in Lucan, nor on parallel scenes, important as they are (Pompey and his wife are reminiscent of Ceyx and Alcyone, as is Caesar of Erysichthon), nor on Erichtho's and

---

1 On this (from another point of view): E.Paratore, "Virgilio georgico e Lucano", *ASNP* 2/12 (1943): 40-69. Cf. also Morford (quoted above, n. 5, pp. 228-229): 28; Caspari (quoted above, n. 4, p. 321): *passim*, esp. 94; Hosius, *De imitatione* ... (quoted above, n. 1, pp. 233-234): *passim*; Thompson, Bruère (quoted above, n. 4, p. 236).

2 Lucan's relationship to Lucretius deserves further investigation.

3 C.Hosius, "Lucan und seine Quellen", *RhM*, n.s, 48 (1893): 380-397, esp. 393-395 (with some very interesting parallels); F.Schwemmler, *De Lucano Manili imitatore* (diss. Giessen 1916); Malcovati (quoted above, n. 4, p. 237): 107.

4 M.P.O.Morford, *The Poet Lucan* (Oxford 1967): 27.

5 Some hints in: S.Viarre, *La survie d'Ovide dans la littérature scientifique des XII^e^ et XIII^e^ siècles* (Poitiers, 1966 = *Publ. du C.E.S.C.M.* 4). Studies on Lucan und Ovid are quoted by W.Rutz, *Lustrum* 9 (1964): 260-261 und 330-331; see also his interpretation of the Erysichthon story as compared to Lucan (diss. quoted above, n. 5, pp. 228-229): 173-176 = 162-165 of the new ed.). See also S.Broglia, "L'apparato magico del 6^{O} libro della Farsaglia", *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere, Filosofia e Magistero della Università di Cagliari* 15 (1948): 203-235, esp. 224-228. R.Pichon (quoted above, n. 2, p. 230): 231-235; M.Korenjak, *Die Ericthoszene in Lukans Pharsalia* (Frankfurt, 1996 = *Studien zur Klassischen Philologie* 101).

Medea's magic, nor even on the programmatic phrase *fert animus* in the introduction. Instead, I would like to dwell on a point which seems to have escaped the attention of scholars, though it might contribute to a better understanding of Lucans's poetic invention.

Our first example is from a mythological narrative (4. 629-653), a type of text rarely found in Lucan. Hercules has laid his enemy Antaeus upon the ground. "But, when the dry earth eagerly drank his sweat, his veins were replenished with warm blood, his muscles swelled out, his whole frame grew tough, and he loosened the grip of Hercules with fresh strength".[1] Lucan splits up the miraculous process into phases and makes the metamorphosis plausible by means of what might be called the logic of magic (sweat runs down, fresh forces arise). This method of "observing" a miracle with the unfailing precision of a scientist's eye and giving it a quasi-scientific explanation had been constantly adopted by Ovid in his descriptions of mythical metamorphoses, and Lucan applies this method, too. But even here, when telling a myth, he does not confront his readers with a monstrous corporeal metamorphosis, but with a much subtler inner process. Here Lucan adapts an Ovidian technique to describe an invisible metamorphosis.

This transferral can be observed in many instances. As a rule, Lucan takes his subject matter from nature or history rather than from myth. Consider, for instance, his description of dead calm. This natural phenomenon is defamiliarized by Lucan in a way which illustrates both his poetic technique and his relationship to Ovid:

5. 434: Aequora lenta iacent, alto torpore ligatae
pigrius inmotis haesere paludibus undae.
sic stat iners Scythicas astringens Bosporos undas,
cum glacie retinente fretum non impulit Hister,
inmensumque gelu tegitur mare.

"The sea lay motionless; chained in dead calm, the waves had less movement than a stagnant pool.- Thus the Bosporus lies idle and binds the Northern Sea, when the Danube, arrested by frost, no longer urges on the deep, and the vast sea is covered with ice."

There follows an image rather unfamiliar to Roman readers: a horseman riding and a carter driving over the ice. Finally, the sea loses its everyday identity to the utmost degree:

[1] Translation: J.D.Duff (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1928, numerous reprints).

5. 450: Noua uota timori
sunt inuenta nouo, fluctus nimiasque precari
uentorum uires, dum se torpentibus unda
excutiat stagnis et sit mare.

"New prayers were found to meet the new danger—prayers for stormy seas and violent winds, if only the sea would rouse itself from its dead stagnation and be sea indeed."

Lucan observes changes in the realm of nature, and he uses the apparatus of epic to describe them. His similes belong, therefore, to a more elevated sphere than his actual subject. They enhance, not merely illustrate it.

But there is more. Lucan's exquisite simile is reminiscent of what Ovid experienced at the Black Sea (where he saw a frozen Danube). By means of paradoxes Lucan conveys to his reader the impression that the sea is no sea any more, that it has been changed. It has lost its own nature and must find it anew (*et sit mare!*).

A similar technique is found in Lucan's description of Scaeva's battle. The wall which he defends had been mentioned early in the book. The poet described how it was built and stressed its huge dimensions. After that, the reader witnesses how the wall gradually vacillates and finally disappears amid the mountains of dead soldiers. At that moment everything depends on Scaeva's prowess. This hero identifies himself completely with his function. Lucan uses rhetorical ἐνάργεια to create a powerful image: "He stands fast, a stone wall in defence of Caesar": *Stat non fragilis pro Caesare murus* (6. 201). This perfectly portrays the mental metamorphosis of a hero utterly absorbed in his mission.

When replacing Ovid's mythological metamorphoses by subtler processes, natural or moral, Lucan adopts a vision that is akin to Ovid both in its "scientific" approach and in its striving for rhetorical ἐνάργεια. Lucan, as it were, transfers Ovid's literary methods from the dimension of myth into the dimension of nature and in so doing he develops certain hints found in Books 1 and 15 of the *Metamorphoses.* But there is a difference of principle: Ovid, by means of his "scientific" and rhetorical approach, tries to have myth appear as if it were real. Lucan, conversely, confers on reality a tinge of the extraordinary and miraculous by applying to it the literary techniques known to us from Ovid. Not satisfied to be a follower of Ovid's artistic principles, he turns out to be, as it were, an anti-Ovid who, instead of bestowing

on his poetic ideas the palpability of real life, defamiliarizes real events through the magic of his poetic imagination.[1]

Conclusion

We had started with the observation that our subject might turn out to be a "negative test" in some respects, revealing what our poet is not, rather than what he is. A possible complement to our study of content would be a study of form, according to different types of scenes. This, however, would go beyond the scope of the present paper. Recent research in this field[2] confirms our conclusion that Lucan's art cannot be explained fully in terms of tradition, not even in its formal aspects. We already mentioned the fact that he, in the way of historiographers, shows considerable freedom in his treatment of the continuity of time and that he does not avoid personal comments of a highly subjective character. We may briefly recall here other deviations from the traditions of epic technique: single combats and even epic similes are relatively rare, and their style is redolent of rhetoric rather than epic; dream scenes are not frequent and their connection with the action is loose. There is no divine machinery, and descriptions of works of art are missing. While Silius Italicus turns imitation of Virgil into an artistic principle and into a main source of his poetic invention (in fact his epic is a continuation of the *Aeneid* much as the *Acts of the Apostles* follow the *Gospels*), the *Pharsalia* defies an approach exclusively based on epic tradition.

Finally, let us sum up in positive terms some features which our "negative test" allowed to grasp.

1. Lucan's subject matter consists of real events, basically devoid of an explicitly mythological superstructure. As the *theologia fabulosa*[3] is lacking, there remain the domains of nature and of history. Their reality is taken very seriously by the poet.[4]

---

[1] Ovid offered him some points of reference in this respect, especially in Books 1 and 15 of the *Metamorphoses*; this is another proof for the wealth of impulses Ovid gave to imperial authors. Lucan's descriptions of the deaths of soldiers bitten by snakes (Lucan 9. 813; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 6. 388) bear the stamp of "meditations on decay". They are comparable to passages in Ovid and Lucretius; Rabirius, too, was intrigued by the theme of death, as the surviving fragments show.

[2] Cf. esp. W.Rutz and H.P.Syndikus (both quoted above, n. 5, pp. 228-229).

[3] Cf. Varro apud Aug., *Civ. Dei* 6. 5.

[4] On the Romans' aversion to fiction: P.Grimal, *Essai sur l'Art poétique d'Horace* (Paris, 1968): 183; the precision of Lucan's information is stressed by R.Castresana Udaeta, *História y política en la Farsália de Marco Anneo Lucano* (Madrid, 1956): 62.

2. However, our poet is not satisfied with merely stating the facts. There is a strong connection between two spheres: according to the Stoics, historical events are reflected in natural phenomena.[1] This is a modern substitute for myth. Thierfelder[2] rightly stressed that Lucan had an unusually profound idea of the meaning of the divine machinery. It is through philosophy that Lucan gains a new poetic view of the world. Not only the Stoics but also the epic poets lent him a helping hand. Virgil's and Homer's myths were alien to him (each of them for different reasons), whereas Lucretius and Ovid (notwithstanding their adherence to other philosophical schools) offered important points of departure.

3. In Lucan's work the objectivity of epic is amalgamated with subjective and lyric elements. This can be considered an uncompromising continuation of a trend initiated by Virgil. As a result the author's personal involvement comes to the fore. The suitable means of expression are furnished by rhetoric. On the other hand, there is a perceptible difference of attitude: Lucan replaces Virgil's introverted and mystic approach with an extroverted attitude, which leads him to the point of ecstasy (ἔκ-στασις) in the literal sense of the word.

4. Lucan's view of history is tragic, and he stands aloof of any attempt at harmonious equilibrium. In this respect Lucan is closer to Homer than to Virgil. Is he more biased than his great predecessors? It is not his intention to write a pamphlet but to present a great chapter of world history in literary form to serve as an example.[3] Is history ultimately devoid of meaning for Lucan?[4] In this field, scholars should proceed with caution. If on a picture representing Good Friday dark colours prevail, this is not to deny the light of Easter. Lucan deliberately created his epic of Rome's agony as a pendant to Virgil's myth of Rome's origin. His insisting on processes of death and

---

On Lucan's "verismo": Piacentini (quoted above, n. 5, pp. 228-229): 39 (with some exaggeration).

[1] On cosmic and cosmological similes: L.Eckardt, *Exkurse und Ekphraseis bei Lucan* (diss. Heidelberg, [1934] 1936): 48-50; cf. also O.Schönberger, "Leitmotivisch wiederholte Bilder bei Lucan", *RhM* 103 (1960): 81-90; F.König, *Mensch und Welt bei Lucan im Spiegel bildhafter Darstellung* (diss. Kiel, 1957).

[2] A.Thierfelder (quoted above, n. 2, p. 236): 5.

[3] A similar view is held by Eichberger (quoted above, n. 1, p. 232): 69-70. Cf. also G.Lafaye, "Les causes de la guerre civile dans César et Pétrone", *RCC*, 2^{e} année, n^{o} 33 (Paris, 1894): 491-497; 533-540, esp. 495: "Ainsi Lucain met en pleine lumière les causes générales que César a dissimulées avec un si grand soin." 497: "On peut même dire, somme toute, que Lucain est plus historien que César."

[4] Lucan, der "Dichter des Widersinns": Thierfelder (quoted above, n. 2, p. 236): 13.

decadence is the result of this concept rather than of some personal sadism or the perverse tastes of his epoch. Nor is the relative hopelessness conveyed to the reader of the *Pharsalia* necessarily an expression of Lucan's personal pessimism. As the *Aeneid* embodies the mystery of Rome's birth, Lucan's *Pharsalia* unfolds the mystery of her death.

5. In his handling of both history and epic tradition Lucan makes proof of remarkable independence. Nevertheless he shows a preference for using precise information and real facts as his points of departure. It is true that epic tradition affords him a language, and he knows how to evoke its undertones through a minimum of signs, but his poetic genius is independent enough to sketch an overall design which is completely his own. Far from composing a mosaic out of ready-made parts, he knows how to dematerialize the achievements of his predecessors to their seminal state, pregnant with latent possibilities. He assimilates them only insofar as they are in accord with his design.[1]

Should Lucan be considered an epic poet? Not in the traditional sense of the word, but in a new one. Epic as *diuinarum humanarumque rerum comprehensio* had become problematic ever since the anthropomorphic gods and the old mythical cosmology had been obliterated by natural science. The epic poet's claim to give a full account of the universe was now fulfilled by philosophers who wrote sublime didactic poems. The pre-Socratics found successors in Rome: even before Lucretius, Ennius incorporated philosophical teaching into his epic poem. Hence, epic poetry in Rome, from its very start, could not stand aloof from philosophical thought. Moreover, anthropomorphic gods of the Greek type were alien to Roman religion which defined gods in terms of power rather than of shape. Correspondingly, the traditional genre of epic developed into new and different shapes of "cosmological poetry".[2] For Lucan, in this respect, Lucretius and Ovid are no less important than the Virgil of the *Georgics*. The Roman concept of cosmic poetry[3] defied both the limits of mythology and the

---

[1] As a result, imitation of complete scenes is not particularly frequent.

[2] The fact that this synthesis was possible speaks in favour of the poetic talent of the Romans. Thus it did not happen that philosophy and history completely fell prey to prose; nor had poetry had to retire into the questionable reservation of fiction.

[3] Vgl. E.Zinn, "Die Dichter des alten Rom und die Anfänge des Weltgedichts", *A&A* 5 (1956): 7-26; repr. in: *Römertum*, ed. by H.Oppermann (Darmstadt, 1962): 155-187.

generic traditions of epic.[1] The *Pharsalia* is an important stage in the Roman development of the epic genre, which indirectly paved the way for no less a cosmic poem than Dante's *Divina Commedia.*

Epilogue: Let us sum up some aspects of rhetoric and intertextuality in Lucan. Through his education and also immediately through his grandfather and his uncle, Lucan was acquainted with the "modern" style of the schools of rhetoric. He eagerly picked up their taste for aphorism which, as applied to history, in some respects anticipated Tacitus and Florus. The emotional potential of rhetoric allowed Lucan to develop a new type of personal comment on the events he reported. These comments represent an innovation within the epic style. What had been in Virgil a slightly melancholic tinge becomes in Lucan an ardent plea. Lucan develops further the passionate style of some narratives in Cicero's *Verrinae.* His affective speech infringes upon the traditional rules of epic objectivity, but it bestows a new inner life on a genre which hitherto had stuck to old traditions. The interesting thing is that, through the subjectivity of his rhetorical impetus, Lucan seems to give his epic text some "lyric"[2] ring.

Intertextual relationships in the *Pharsalia* are found on different levels: there is both a visible contrast to Virgil and, on closer inspection, some agreement with the classic of Roman epic. As for Homer, as well, there are considerable differences and surprising similarities. Ovid, in some regard, shares the fate of both these authors: he is demythified and reinterpreted in terms of natural science.

On a higher level of "intertextuality" (interference of systems or "codes" rather than individual texts) Lucan's factual and "scientific" approach contradicts the mythological traditions of epic even though in Rome, from Naevius onward, the reality of history had been a leading theme, and Virgil and Ovid had included some elements of natural science into their epics; so Lucan was only consistent when he, to a great extent, replaced mythological with philosophical cosmology. This historical and, for an epic poet, largely un-mythological approach turned out to be favourable to the acceptance of the *Pharsalia* by Christian readers.

---

[1] Other genres influenced Lucan as well: elements of elegy, bucolic, satire are amalgamated into the *Pharsalia.*

[2] No need to say that for the ancients there was no irreconcilable conflict between lyric and rhetoric, a conflict overstated by critics like Benedetto Croce.

CHAPTER TEN

VALERIUS FLACCUS

Elocutio. *The Myth of Io or the Magic of the Present Participle*[1]

Ovid, *Met.* 1. 583-751[2]

Inachus unus abest imoque reconditus antro
fletibus auget aquas natamque miserrimus Io
luget ut amissam; nescit, uitane fruatur
an sit apud manes, sed quam non inuenit usquam,
esse putat nusquam atque animo peiora ueretur.
uiderat a patrio redeuntem Iuppiter illam
flumine et 'o uirgo Ioue digna tuoque beatum
nescio quem factura toro, pete' dixerat 'umbras
altorum nemorum' (et nemorum monstrauerat umbras)

---

[1] For bibliographical information see e.g. M.Scaffai, "Rassegna di studi su Valerio Flacco (1938-1982)", *ANRW* 2, 32, 4 (1986): 2359-2447; M.von Albrecht, in: Haupt-Korn-Ehwald, *Commentary on Ovid's Metamorphoses*, vol. 1 (Zürich-Dublin, 10th ed. 1966) and id., "Forschungsbericht: Ovid", *AAHG* 25 (1972): 267-290; id., *History of Roman Literature*, Leiden 1997, chapters "Ovid" and "Valerius Flaccus". The Io-myth is discussed by E.Lüthje, *Gehalt und Aufriß der Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus*, diss. (Kiel, 1971): 154-160; Lüthje considers this episode the best poetic achievement of Orpheus; forming a parallel to the episode in Mysia (3. 481-740) and, more generally, to the destiny of Hercules, the Io-story is anchored to the whole of Valerius' epic. A shorter discussion in connection with the myth of Helle is found in J.Adamietz, *Zur Komposition der Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus* (= *Zetemata* 67, München, 1976): 40-42. On Flaccus' language: A.J.Kleywegt, "Die Dichtersprache des Valerius Flaccus", *ANRW* II, 32, 4 (1986): 2448-2490 (on neologism, case construction, variation of syntax, word order, new meanings assigned to words, unusual combination of words, brevity, oxymoron, personification, double sense, variation and combination of borrowings); see further S.Contino, *Lingua e stile in Valerio Flacco* (Bologna, 1977); J.G.Fitch, "Aspects of Valerius Flaccus' Use of Similes", *TAPhA* 106 (1976): 113-124; R.W.Garson, "Valerius Flaccus the Poet", *CQ* 20 (1970): 181-187; J.B.Perkins, "An Aspect of the Style of Valerius Flaccus' Argonauticon", *Phoenix* 28 (1974): 290-313; M.L.Ricci, "Di alcune similitudini mitologiche in Valerio Flacco", *SIFC* 49 (1977): 145-196; G.Williams, *Change and Decline. Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1978): 193-312; S.A.Cecchin, "Intreccio e tempo narrativo nelle Argonautiche di Valerio Flacco", *CCC* 1 (1980): 349-370; A.La Penna, "Tipi e modelli femminili nella poesia dell'epoca dei Flavi", in: autori vari, *Atti del Congresso di Studi Vespasianei* (Rieti, 1979): 223-251; P.Venini, "Sulla struttura delle *Argonautiche* di Valerio Flacco", *RIL* 105 (1971): 597-620.

[2] Text: W.S.Anderson (Leipzig, 1977; repr. 1982); Translation: A.D.Melville (Oxford, 1986; paperback: 1987).

'dum calet et medio sol est altissimus orbe.
quodsi sola times latebras intrare ferarum,
praeside tuta deo nemorum secreta subibis,
nec de plebe deo, sed qui caelestia magna
sceptra manu teneo, sed qui uaga fulmina mitto.
ne fuge me!' fugiebat enim. iam pascua Lernae
consitaque arboribus Lyrcea reliquerat arua,
cum deus inducta latas caligine terras
occuluit tenuitque fugam rapuitque pudorem.
interea medios Iuno despexit in agros,
et noctis faciem nebulas fecisse uolucres
sub nitido mirata die non fluminis illas
esse nec umenti sensit tellure remitti
atque, suus coniunx ubi sit, circumspicit, ut quae
deprensi totiens iam nosset furta mariti.
quem postquam caelo non repperit, 'aut ego fallor
aut ego laedor' ait delapsaque ab aethere summo
constitit in terris nebulasque recedere iussit.
coniugis aduentum praesenserat inque nitentem
Inachidos uultus mutauerat ille iuuencam
(bos quoque formosa est): speciem Saturnia uaccae,
quamquam inuita, probat nec non, et cuius et unde
quoue sit armento, ueri quasi nescia quaerit;
Iuppiter e terra genitam mentitur, ut auctor
desinat inquiri: petit hanc Saturnia munus.
quid faciat? crudele suos addicere amores,
non dare suspectum est: pudor est, qui suadeat illinc,
hinc dissuadet amor. uictus pudor esset amore,
sed, leue si munus sociae generisque torique
uacca negaretur, poterat non uacca uideri.
paelice donata non protinus exuit omnem
diua metum timuitque Iouem et fuit anxia furti,
donec Arestoridae seruandam tradidit Argo.
Centum luminibus cinctum caput Argus habebat:
inde suis uicibus capiebant bina quietem,
cetera seruabant atque in statione manebant.
constiterat quocumque modo, spectabat ad Io:
ante oculos Io, quamuis auersus, habebat.
luce sinit pasci; cum sol tellure sub alta est,
claudit et indigno circumdat uincula collo.
frondibus arboreis et amara pascitur herba
proque toro terrae non semper gramen habenti
incubat infelix limosaque flumina potat;
illa etiam supplex Argo cum bracchia uellet
tendere, non habuit, quae bracchia tenderet Argo,
et conata queri mugitus edidit ore
pertimuitque sonos propriaque exterrita uoce est.
uenit et ad ripas, ubi ludere saepe solebat,
Inachidas ripas, nouaque ut conspexit in unda
cornua, pertimuit seque exsternata refugit.

naides ignorant, ignorat et Inachus ipse,
quae sit; at illa patrem sequitur sequiturque sorores
et patitur tangi seque admirantibus offert.
decerptas senior porrexerat Inachus herbas:
illa manus lambit patriisque dat oscula palmis
nec retinet lacrimas, et, si modo uerba sequantur,
oret opem nomenque suum casusque loquatur;
littera pro uerbis, quam pes in puluere duxit,
corporis indicium mutati triste peregit.
'me miserum!' exclamat pater Inachus inque gementis
cornibus et niueae pendens ceruice iuuencae
'me miserum!' ingeminat, 'tune es quaesita per omnes
nata mihi terras? tu non inuenta reperta
luctus eras leuior. retices nec mutua nostris
dicta refers, alto tantum suspiria ducis
pectore, quodque unum potes, ad mea uerba remugis.
at tibi ego ignarus thalamos taedasque parabam,
spesque fuit generi mihi prima, secunda nepotum:
de grege nunc tibi uir et de grege natus habendus.
nec finire licet tantos mihi morte dolores,
sed nocet esse deum, praeclusaque ianua leti
aeternum nostros luctus extendit in aeuum.'
talia maerentem stellatus submouet Argus,
ereptamque patri diuersa in pascua natam
abstrahit; ipse procul montis sublime cacumen
occupat, unde sedens partes speculatur in omnes.
nec superum rector mala tanta Phoronidos ultra
ferre potest natumque uocat, quem lucida partu
Pleias enixa est, letoque det imperat Argum.
parua mora est alas pedibus uirgamque potenti
somniferam sumpsisse manu tegumenque capillis;
haec ubi disposuit, patria Ioue natus ab arce
desilit in terras. illic tegumenque remouit
et posuit pennas, tantummodo uirga retenta est:
hac agit ut pastor per deuia rura capellas,
dum uenit, adductas et structis cantat auenis.
uoce noua et captus custos Iunonius arte
'quisquis es, hoc poteras mecum considere saxo',
Argus ait, 'neque enim pecori fecundior ullo
herba loco est, aptamque uides pastoribus umbram.'
sedit Atlantiades et euntem multa loquendo
detinuit sermone diem iunctisque canendo
uincere harundinibus seruantia lumina temptat.
ille tamen pugnat molles euincere somnos
et, quamuis sopor est oculorum parte receptus,
parte tamen uigilat; quaerit quoque (namque reperta
fistula nuper erat), qua sit ratione reperta.
tum deus 'Arcadiae gelidis in montibus' inquit
'inter hamadryadas celeberrima Nonacrinas
naias una fuit, nymphae Syringa uocabant.

non semel et satyros eluserat illa sequentes
et quoscumque deos umbrosaque silua feraxque
rus habet; Ortygiam studiis ipsaque colebat
uirginitate deam; ritu quoque cincta Dianae
falleret et posset credi Latonia, si non
corneus huic arcus, si non foret aureus illi;
sic quoque fallebat. redeuntem colle Lycaeo
Pan uidet hanc pinuque caput praecinctus acuta
talia uerba refert'—restabat uerba referre
et precibus spretis fugisse per auia nympham,
donec harenosi placidum Ladonis ad amnem
uenerit: hic illam cursum inpedientibus undis,
ut se mutarent, liquidas orasse sorores,
Panaque, cum prensam sibi iam Syringa putaret,
corpore pro nymphae calamos tenuisse palustres,
dumque ibi suspirat, motos in harundine uentos
effecisse sonum tenuem similemque querenti;
arte noua uocisque deum dulcedine captum
'hoc mihi conloquium tecum' dixisse 'manebit',
atque ita disparibus calamis conpagine cerae
inter se iunctis nomen tenuisse puellae.
talia dicturus uidit Cyllenius omnes
succubuisse oculos adopertaque lumina somno;
supprimit extemplo uocem firmatque soporem
languida permulcens medicata lumina uirga.
nec mora, falcato nutantem uulnerat ense,
qua collo est confine caput, saxoque cruentum
deicit et maculat praeruptam sanguine rupem.
Arge, iaces, quodque in tot lumina lumen habebas,
exstinctum est, centumque oculos nox occupat una.
excipit hos uolucrisque suae Saturnia pennis
conlocat et gemmis caudam stellantibus inplet.
protinus exarsit nec tempora distulit irae
horriferamque oculis animoque obiecit Erinyn
paelicis Argolicae stimulosque in pectore caecos
condidit et profugam per totum terruit orbem.
ultimus inmenso restabas, Nile, labori;
quem simulac tetigit, positisque in margine ripae
procubuit genibus resupinoque ardua collo,
quos potuit solos, tollens ad sidera uultus
et gemitu et lacrimis et luctisono mugitu
cum Ioue uisa queri finemque orare malorum.
coniugis ille suae conplexus colla lacertis,
finiat ut poenas tandem, rogat 'in' que 'futurum
pone metus' inquit, 'numquam tibi causa doloris
haec erit' et Stygias iubet hoc audire paludes.
ut lenita dea est, uultus capit illa priores
fitque, quod ante fuit: fugiunt e corpore saetae,
cornua decrescunt, fit luminis artior orbis,
contrahitur rictus, redeunt umerique manusque

ungulaque in quinos dilapsa absumitur ungues:
de boue nil superest formae nisi candor in illa;
officioque pedum nymphe contenta duorum
erigitur metuitque loqui, ne more iuuencae
mugiat, et timide uerba intermissa retemptat.
nunc dea linigera colitur celeberrima turba,
nunc Epaphus magni genitus de semine tandem
creditur esse Iouis perque urbes iuncta parenti
templa tenet.

But one is absent, Inachus, withdrawn deep in his cave and weeping tears that swell his current, as he mourns in bitter grief Io, his daughter lost. He cannot tell whether she lives (585) or dwells among the shades, and finding her nowhere thinks she must be nowhere and fear feeds fear when knowledge fails. Io returning from her father's stream had caught Jove's eye. 'You charming girl', he said, 'well worthy of Jove's love, happy is he, whoe'er he be, that wins you for his bed. Go to the deep wood's shade' (590)—he pointed to the shady wood—'the hour is hot; the sun shines in his zenith. If you fear alone to risk the wild beasts' lairs, a god will guard you and in the deepest forest keep you safe—no common god! The sceptre of the sky (595) is mine to hold in my almighty hand; I wield at will the roaming thunderbolts—no, do not run!' For now the girl had run; through Lerna's meadows and the forest lands of high Lyrceus she sped until the god drew down a veil of darkness to conceil the world and stayed her flight and ravished her. (600) Juno meanwhile observed the land of Argos and wondered that the floating clouds had wrought in the bright day the darkness of the night. These were no river mists! No clouds like these the humid earth exhaled! She looked around to find her husband; (605) well she knew his tricks, so often had caught him in his escapades; and searched the sky in vain. 'If I'm not wrong', she thought, 'I'm being wronged'; and gliding down from heaven's height she lighted on the earth and bade the clouds disperse. Jove had fore-sensed his spouse's visit and transformed poor Io (610) into a sleek white heifer (lovely still although a cow). Juno, against her will, admired the creature and asked whose she was, and whence she came and to what herd belonged, pretending not to know the truth. He lied—'The earth had brought her forth'—so (615) to deflect questions about her birth. Then Juno begged the heifer as a gift. What should he do? Too cruel to give his darling! Not to give—suspicious; shame persuades but love dissuades. Love would have won; but then—if he refused his wife (his sister too) so slight a gift, (620) a cow, it well might seem no cow at all! The goddess won her rival, but distrust lingered and still she feared her husband's tricks, till, for safe-keeping, she had given the cow to Argus—Argus of the hundred eyes, (625) all watching and on duty round his head, save two which took in turn their sleep and rest. Whichever way he stood he looked at Io, Io before his eyes behind his back! By day he let her graze, but when the sun sank down beneath the earth (630) he stabled her and tied—for shame!—a halter round her neck. She browsed on leaves of trees and bitter weeds, and for her bed, poor thing, lay on the ground, not always grassy, and drank the muddy streams; and when, to plead with Argus, she would try to stretch her arms, (635) she had no arms to stretch. Would she

complain, a moo came from her throat, a startling sound—her own voice frightened her. She reached her father's river and the banks where often she had played and, in the water, mirrored she saw her muzzle (640) and her horns, and fled in terror from the self she saw. The Naiads did not know—not even her father knew who she was, but she, disconsolate, followed her sisters, followed her father, let them stroke her, offered herself to be admired. Old Inachus picked grass and held it out; (645) she licked her father's hand, cow-kissed his palms; her tears rolled down; if only words would come, she'd speak her name, tell all, implore their aid. For words her hoof traced letters in the dust—I, O—sad tidings of her body's change. (650) 'Alas, alack!' her father cried, and clasped the moaning heifer's horns and snow-white neck. 'Alas, alack!' he groaned: 'Are you the child I sought through all the world? Oh, lighter grief you were unfound than found. You give no answer; silent, (655) but from your heart so deep a sigh! A moo—all you can say—is your reply! I, knowing naught, made ready for your marriage, hoped for a son-in-law and grandchildren. But now the herd must find your husband, find your child. (660) For me death cannot end my woes. Sad bane to be a god! The gates of death are shut; my grief endures for evermore.' As thus they grieved, Argus, star-eyed, drove off daughter from father, hurrying her away to distant pastures. (665) Then himself, afar, high on a mountain top sat sentinel to keep his scrutiny on every side. But now heaven's master could no more endure Io's distress, and summoned Mercury, his son, whom the bright shining Pleiad bore, and charged him to accomplish Argus' death. (670) Promptly he fastened on his ankle-wings, grasped in his fist the wand that charms to sleep, put on his magic cap, and thus arrayed Jove's son sprang from his father's citadel down to the earth. There he removed his cap, laid by his wings; only his wand he kept. (675) A herdsman now, he drove a flock of goats through the green byways, gathered as he went, and played his pipes of reed. The strange sweet skill charmed Juno's guardian. 'My friend', he called, 'whoever you are, well might you sit with me here on this rock; (680) nowhere is lusher grass to feed your flock, and see how cool the shade extends congenial for a shepherd's seat.' So Mercury joined him, and with many a tale he stayed the passing hours and on his reeds played soft refrains to lull the watching eyes. (685) But Argus fought to keep at bay the charms of slumber and, though many of his eyes were closed in sleep, still many kept their guard. He asked too by what means this new design (for new it was), the pipe of reeds, was found. Then Mercury told this story: 'Once there lived on the cold mountainsides of Arcady a Naiad, (690) who among the forest sprites of lofty Nonacris was most renowned. Syrinx the Naiads called her. Many a time she foiled the chasing satyrs and those gods who haunt the shady copses and the coverts of the lush countryside. In her pursuits—(695) and in her chastity—Syrinx revered Diana; girt like her she well might seem (so easy to mistake) Diana's self, were not her bow of horn, Diana's gold. Indeed she was mistaken. Pan returning from Mount Lycaeus, crowned with his wreath of pine, saw Syrinx once (700) and said—'but what he said remained to tell, and how the scornful nymph fled through the wilderness and came at last to Ladon's peaceful sandy stream, and there, her flight barred by the river, begged her sisters, the water-nymphs, to change her; (705) and, when Pan thought he had captured her, he held instead only the tall marsh reeds,

and, while he sighed, the soft wind stirring in the reeds sent forth a thin and plaintive sound; and he, entranced by this new music and its witching tones, cried (710) 'You and I shall stay in unison!' And waxed together reeds of different lengths and made the pipes that keep his darling's name. The tale remained untold; for Mercury saw all Argus' eyelids closed and every eye vanquished in sleep. (715) He stopped and with his wand, his magic wand, soothed the tired resting eyes and sealed their slumber; quick then with his sword struck off the nodding head and from the rock threw it all bloody, spattering the cliff with gore. (720) Argus lay dead; so many eyes, so bright quenched, and all hundred shrouded in one night. Juno retrieved those eyes to set in place among the feathers of her bird and filled his tail with starry jewels. At once her wrath flared up and soon her anger was fulfilled. (725) Before her rival's eyes and in her mind she set a frightful Fury and deep down plunged blinding goads of fear; and Io fled a cowering fugitive through all the world. Her boundless travails found their end at last beside the Nile; (730) there, falling on her knees, her head thrown back, she raised towards the stars all she could raise, her face; her groans and tears, her wild grief-laden lowings seemed to send a prayer to Jove to end her sufferings. And Jove pleaded with Juno, throwing his arms around her neck, (735) to end the punishment at last. 'Lay fear aside; never again', he swore, 'shall Io give you cause to grieve', and charged the pools of Styx to attest his oath. The goddess was appeased. Io regained her shape, became once more what once she was. The hair falls from her hide, (740) her horns are gone, her great wide eyes contract, her gaping mouth shrinks small again, her arms and hands return, her cloven hoofs resume their fivefold form; the heifer vanished, save her fair white grace. The nymph, content to use two legs again, (745) now walked erect, yet still afraid to speak lest, cow-like, she might moo, and timorously essayed the syllables so long disused. She is a goddess now, famous, divine, and linen-robed adorers throng her shrine. To her a son was born, young Epaphus, sprung, it was thought, at last from Jove's begetting, and in each town he shared his mother's (750) shrines.

Val. Fl. 4. 344-422[1]

Iamque dies auraeque uocant, rursusque capessunt
aequora, qua rigidos eructat Bosphoros amnes.
illos, Nile, tuis nondum dea gentibus Io
transierat fluctus, unde haec data nomina ponto.
tum pius Oeagri claro de sanguine uates,
admonita genetrice, refert casusque locorum
Inachidosque uias pelagusque emensa iuuencae
exilia intentisque canit: "uidere priores
saepe Iouem in terras Argiuaque regna Pelasgum
uirginis Iasiae blandos descendere ad ignes.
sentit Iuno dolos curaque accensa iugali
aethere desiluit; dominam Lyrceia tellus

[1] Text and translation: J.H.Mozley (Cambridge, Mass., 1934; repr. 1963).

antraque deprensae tremuerunt conscia culpae.
tum trepida Inachiae paelex subit ora iuuencae
sponte dei; plausu fouet hanc et pectora mulcet
Iuno renidenti cohibens suspiria uultu.
mox ita adorta Iouem: 'da quam modo ditibus Argis
campus alit primae referentem cornua Phoebes
indomitamque bouem, da carae munera nuptae.
ipsa ego dilectae pecudi iam pascua digna
praecipuosque legam fontes.' qua fraude negaret
aut quos inuentos tenuisset Iuppiter astus?
muneris illa potens custodem protinus Argum
adiungit; custos Argus placet, inscia somni
lumina non aliter toto cui uertice, quam si
Lyda nurus sparso telas maculauerit ostro.
Argus et in scopulos et monstris horrida lustra
ignotas iubet ire uias heu multa morantem
conantemque preces inclusaque pectore uerba.
ultima tum patriae cedens dedit oscula ripae.
fleuit Amymone, flerunt Messeides undae,
fleuit et effusis reuocans Hyperia lacertis.
illa ubi uel fessi tremerent erroribus artus,
uel rueret summo iam frigidus aethere uesper,
heu quotiens saxo posuit latus! aut ubi longa
aegra siti, quos ore lacus, quae pabula carpsit!
uerbere candentes quotiens exhorruit armos!
quin et ab excelso meditantem uertice saltus
audentemque mori ualles citus egit in imas
Argus et arbitrio durus seruauit erili:
cum subito Arcadio sonuit caua fistula ritu
imperiumque patris celerans Cyllenius ales
aduenit et leni modulatur carmina auena
'quo' que ait 'hinc diuersus abis? heus respice cantus!'
haud procul insectans Argum languentia iam iam
lumina cuncta notat dulcesque sequentia somnos,
et celerem mediis in cantibus exigit harpen.
iamque refecta Ioui paulatim in imagine prisca
ibat agris Io uictrix Iunonis, at ecce
cum facibus flagrisque et Tartareo ululatu
Tisiphonen uidet: ac primo uestigia uisu
figit et in miserae rursus bouis ora recurrit,
nec qua ualle memor, nec quo se uertice sistat.
Inachias errore etiam defertur ad undas
qualis et a prima quantum mutata iuuenca!
nec pater aut trepidae temptant accedere nymphae.
ergo iterum siluas, iterum petit inuia retro
ceu Styga dilectum fugiens caput; inde per urbes
raptatur Graias atque ardua flumina ripis,
oblato donec paulum cunctata profundo
incidit: absistunt fluctus et gnara futuri
dant pauidae alta uiam; celsis procul ipsa refulget

cornibus ac summa palearia sustinet unda.
ast Erebi uirgo ditem uolat aethere Memphin
praecipere et Pharia uenientem pellere terra.
contra Nilus adest et toto gurgite torquens
Tisiphonen agit atque imis inlidit harenis
Ditis opem ac saeui clamantem numina regni;
apparent sparsaeque faces disiectaque longe
uerbera et abruptis excussi crinibus hydri.
nec Iouis interea cessat manus; intonat alto
insurgens caelo genitor curamque fatetur,
atque ipsa imperium Iuno pauet. haec procul Io
spectat ab arce Phari iam diuis addita iamque
aspide cincta comas et ouanti persona sistro.
Bosphoron hinc ueteres errantis nomine diuae
uulgauere; iuuet nostros nunc ipsa labores
immissisque ratem sua per freta prouehat Euris."
Dixerat; et placidi tendebant carbasa uenti.

And now day and the breezes call them, and once more they take to the seas, where Bosporus spews forth its frozen streams. (345) These very waves Io, not yet a goddess to thy folk, O Nile, had crossed, whence the strait had its name. Then the pious bard of renowned Oeagrus' line invoking his mother's aid tells of the places and their story, of Inachus' daughter and her wanderings, and how the heifer ranged the (350) sea in exile: eagerly do they hearken to his song. "Oft did our fathers see Jupiter come down to earth and the Pelasgians' Argive realm, aflame for the coy Iasian maid. Juno, aware of his deceit and aglow with bridal fears, leapt down from heaven; the Lyrceian land (355) and its bowers, their guilty secret known, trembled before the queen. Then did the frightened paramour with the god's will take on the form of an Inachian heifer; Juno caresses her and soothes her breast, stifling her own sighs beneath a smiling countenance. Then she accosts Jove thus: 'Give me the untamed heifer that feeds on Argos' (360) fertile plains and is just showing the horns of the infant moon; give her as a gift to thy dear bride. Myself now will I choose fit pastures and choicest fountains for my pet.' What ruse could Jove find to say her nay? what trickery, once found, could he have maintained? (365) She, possessed of the gift, straightway sets Argus on guard; Argus as guardian pleases her, for everywhere on his head are sleepless eyes, as though a Lydian bride should bedeck her web with flecks of purple. At Argus' bidding must she go on paths unknown, over rocks, through monster-haunted wilds, (370) tarrying oft, alas! and struggling with prayers and words fast locked within her breast. Then departing gave she last kisses to her father's banks; wailed Amymone, wailed Messeis' waters, wailed Hyperia with arms outstretched to call her back. (375) But she, when her limbs trembled aweary of her wandering or when now chilly evening sped down from heaven's height—ah! how often laid she her body on a stone, or when long thirst made her faint, what pools did her lips drink, what pastures graze, how oft did her white shoulders quail before the lash! (380) Nay, too, as daring death she planned to leap from some lofty height, swift did Argus drive her down to the vale beneath, and cruelly saved her at his queen's behest: when on a

sudden a hollow flute pipes out a measure of Arcady, and the winged Cyllenian, hastening to obey his sire, (385) draws nigh, and tuning his soft reed to melody cries, 'Whither away? where roamest thou? Ho there! give heed to my music!' Following Argus close he notes that all his eyes are already languishing and seeking after sweet slumber, and in the midst of his song out he flashes his swift blade. (390) And now, her former shape gradually restored by Jove, Io is walking the fields victorious over Juno, when lo! she sees Tisiphone with brands of fire and coiling snakes and fiendish yells; at the first sight she stops and passes once again into the shape of a hapless heifer, (395) nor bethinks her in what vale or on what height to stay her steps. Wandering she comes even to the waters of Inachus, how faring and how changed from that first heifer that she was! Nor do her father or the frightened nymphs try to draw nigh her. Therefore once more she seeks the woods, once more the pathless wilds, (400) fleeing from that dear head as from hateful Styx; and thence is she hurried through Grecian towns and steep-banked rivers, until the deep waters meet her, and hesitating awhile she plunges in: the waves part and the ocean foreknowing the future yields her timid steps a path; (405) with high horns she gleams afar, and upholds her dewlaps on the summit of the wave. But the maid of Erebus flies through the air to rich Memphis to be beforehand and repel the new-comer from the Pharian land. But Nile withstands Tisiphone and driving her with all his eddying flood plunges her to the depths of his sandy bed, (410) calling for help to Dis and all the powers of that cruel realm; here and there are seen her brands and whips far scattered, and the serpents shaken from her dishevelled hair. Nor meanwhile is Jove's hand idle; the Father arising thunders from high heaven and makes his anger known, (415) and Juno herself quails before his word. All this from Pharos' height afar Io beholds, now added to the gods, with snake-girt hair and loud triumphant sistrum. Hence was it that men of old spread abroad the story of Bosphorus, so called from the wandering goddess; may she herself now help our toils, (420) and sending winds to aid us urge our vessel through her own strait." His tale was done; and calm winds were making the canvas fill.

The Two Narratives in Their Contexts

Before comparing the narratives in Ovid and Valerius Flaccus, let us consider their position in the contexts of both works. Ovid provides the following context: Daphne, the daughter of the river-god Peneus, had been transformed into a laurel. On this occasion the other rivers came to her father not knowing whether to congratulate him or to express their sympathy; only one of them was lacking, Inachus, who was mourning his own daughter. This is the beginning of the Io story, which starts with a flashback introduced in the pluperfect. The episode ends with the apotheosis of Io, who becomes Isis. A quarrel between her son, Epaphus, and his friend Phaethon forms the transition to the next myth.

At first glance there is only a loose connection between this story and its context. There is a clear caesura before the story's beginning whereas at the end the contours are somewhat blurred (747-750); anaphora and enjambment create an impression of continuity which is not fully justified. As Walther Ludwig[1] has shown, the links between this episode and its context are not found on the level of the technique of transition but on the level of theme; in fact, the Io myth is one of three divine love stories narrated in the second half of Book 1 (the same theme will recur, after the important Phaethon panel, in the second half of Book 2: Callisto, Coronis, Herse, Europa). On the other hand, Ovid will come back to Isis in Book 9 at some length (686-797). The religious element, which is prominent there, is felt much less in Book 1, where it is even avoided.

In the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus the Io episode is introduced when the Argonauts, after their victory over Amycus, approach the Bosporus. This name, which is etymologically derived from βοῦς ("cow") and πόρος ("ford"), gives occasion to insert the story of the wanderings of Io, who had been changed into a cow. Hence, the myth figures as an αἴτιον. It is introduced as a song of Orpheus, the bard's most important performance within the *Argonautica* (cf. n. 1, p. 195), and is carefully interwoven with its context; the same motifs are found before and after it: favorable winds (*aurae* 344 and *placidi uenti* 422), the explanation of the name of Bosporus (347 and 419), and the mention of the Nile (346 and 417).

Valerius independently introduced this narrative, which is lacking in Apollonius Rhodius. He may have been encouraged to do so by the increasing interest his contemporaries took in Isis; it was for similar reasons that he enhanced the role of Hercules. Erich Lüthje[2] rightly stressed the parallels between the destinies of Io and Hercules, but went too far in claiming that the song of Orpheus is a "musical achievement"[3] matching the exploits of Hercules, an idea not overtly expressed in Valerius' text. Nevertheless it might be more than mere chance that Valerius Flaccus, in both cases, followed Ovid, a poet who in many respects set the trend for the literary tastes of the imperial

---

[1] W.Ludwig, *Struktur und Einheit der Metamorphosen Ovids* (Berlin, 1965): passim, esp. 20-26.

[2] E.Lüthje, *Gehalt und Aufriß der Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus* (diss. Kiel, 1971): 154-160.

[3] Lüthje, ibid. 155; Lüthje's view is indirectly confirmed by Feeney, quoted below, n. 1, p. 273.

epoch.[1] However, a comparative study of the two texts will reveal considerable differences between the two poets.

Ovid's Narrative

Let us now take a closer look at the Ovidian narrative: Jupiter catches sight of Io and at once falls in love with her; she runs away, but he conquers her under the protection of a cloud (588-600). This first paragraph is seen through the eyes of Jupiter. Then there is a change of perspective (*interea* 601 shows that two successive narrative units overlap). Juno observes the cloud, but is unable to find a natural explanation for the phenomenon. Since she does not discover her husband anywhere, she concludes: "If I'm not wrong, ... I'm being wronged"[2] *aut ego fallor / aut ego laedor* (607-608). She thus comes down to earth and dissipates the fog (601-609).

Again, there is a change of perspective (combined with a small step backward in chronology). Jupiter, anticipating the arrival of his wife, changed Io into a cow (the pluperfect used in 610-611 indicates a *fait accompli*). Even as a cow, Io is beautiful (this crucial sentence [612] should not be degraded to a Ehwaldean parenthesis), and Juno praising the animal's beauty asks about its origin. Two inserted appositions, however, indicate her true thoughts and feelings: "against her will" *quamquam inuita* (613) and "pretending not to know the truth" *ueri quasi nescia* (614). Jupiter seeks for excuses, but Juno asks him to give her the cow as a gift. Ovid develops the god's dilemma in the form of antitheses. Jupiter is unable to invent a ruse (he is not Mercury), and Juno gets what she wants. Jealousy then prompts Juno to give Io a guardian, the hundred-eyed Argus. The description of Argus makes an epigrammatic point typical of Ovid, based on the simultaneous presence of opposites ("Whichever way he stood, he looked at Io, Io before his eyes behind his back" *ante oculos Io quamuis auersus habebat* 629); a similar play on the physical appearance of a god had been found in the very introduction of the story where a mourning Inachus was said to increase his floods by his tears: *fletibus auget aquas* (584).

---

[1] Karl Galinsky justly qualified this statement: G.K.Galinsky, "Was Ovid a Silver Latin Poet?", *ICS* 14 (1989): 69-88. The following lines will reveal further differences between Ovid and a Silver Age poet.

[2] Translation: A.D.Melville (Oxford, 1986; paperback: Oxford and New York, 1987).

In a self-contained paragraph, Ovid describes Io's predicament and her state of mind (630-641). There is another clear antithesis: during the day she is allowed to graze; at night she is not allowed to move. Both her food and her bed are unworthy of a god's daughter, and she is even compelled to drink muddy water, a naturalistic detail which Ovid could not resist: *limosaque flumina potat* (634). Her state of mind is desperate: unable to express herself through gestures or words, she is terrified by hearing her own voice and seeing her mirror-image. This is one of the most concise and moving scenes in Ovid. Unfortunately the poet would twice come back to it (603-604; 732), repetitions which slightly detract from the scene's effect on the reader: "Ovid is incapable of leaving well alone."[1] *Ouidius nescit quod bene cessit relinquere* (Seneca, *Contr.* 9. 5. 17).

There follows another self-contained paragraph (642-650): Io joins her sisters and her father who do not recognize her, until two letters traced in the sand reveal the sad truth to them. The father's highly rhetorical complaint ("Oh, lighter grief you were unfound than found" *tu non inuenta reperta / luctus eras leuior* 654-655; "Sad bane to be a god!" ... *sed nocet esse deum* 662) is brutally interrupted by Argus (651-667), who leads Io away and occupies a hill to watch her.

Finally, Jupiter sends Mercury to kill Argus. Here the narrative proceeds in small steps; Ovid omits no link in the chain. Argus hears Mercury playing the Syrinx and asks him to keep him company. The cunning god enthralls him with his music and his story—here Ovid inserts the myth of Pan and Syrinx—and Argus finally falls asleep. Mercury strikes his eyes with his magic rod and beheads him with his sickle-shaped sword, the *harpe*. Argus' death gives occasion to a typically Ovidian epigram ("So many eyes so bright /quenched, and all hundred shrouded in one night" *centumque oculos nox occupat una* 721). Juno then transposes the eyes of her servant onto the tail of her bird, the peacock, and with this metamorphosis we reach the end of the present paragraph (668-723).

After this, Juno urges an Erinys to chase Io all over the world. Upon arriving at the Nile, the unfortunate woman goes down on her knees, as if she were asking Jupiter to end her sufferings. Thereupon, the god flatters Juno, soothing her with the promise never to touch Io again (*numquam tibi causa doloris / haec erit* 736-737; *haec* sticks out at the beginning of the line; there is no general promise of faithfulness).

---

[1] Translation: M.Winterbottom (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1974).

Thus, Ovid elegantly avoids having Jupiter commit perjury whereas in Hesiod (*Catal. Frg.* 4) Jupiter, surprised by Juno, is said to have changed Io and to have sworn (no more believably than Agamemnon) that he had never touched the girl. Nevertheless, sticking to his main theme, metamorphosis, Ovid dwells particularly on the cow's transformation back into Io. A brief note on her cult and on her son Epaphus serves as a transition to the next story.

To sum up some crucial features of the present narrative: the poet uses the rhetorical technique of ἐνάργεια ("graphic vividness") to put even incredible things before the reader's eye as if they were real. On the whole Ovid's narrative is uninterrupted; this is likewise true of the connections between stories (cf. Ovid's program in *Met.* 1. 4: "one continuous song" *carmen perpetuum*), although the transitions seem quite arbitrary sometimes. Thematic links are more important for the arrangement of the stories than the devices actually used to manage the transitions.

Ovid describes most captivatingly Io's state of mind. No less absorbing is the contrast between Juno's words and her thoughts. To reveal this antithesis Ovid uses elements of syntax which are clearly detached from the rest of the sentence, such as parenthesis or apposition. The speed of his narrative also varies according to a premeditated plan. Much has been said about Ovid's so-called talkativeness, but his brevity and the artful conciseness of his style also deserve acknowledgment, as we see here. As long as the reader's mind is in suspense Ovid's narrative is detailed and no link in the chain is missing. Once the crucial event has happened and the reader's curiosity is satisfied, Ovid is brief and passes over to the next story.

Valerius Flaccus' Narrative

Let us now turn to Valerius Flaccus. His Io story is much shorter than Ovid's; it has less than half its length (78 instead of 164 lines). This is owing partly to omissions, partly to concentration. What is more, Valerius finds space for important additions. A striking feature is his omission of the framing perspective of the mournful father (to which Ovid had come back even after the middle of the narrative, thus enhancing sympathy: ἐλεεινόν). Flaccus insists rather on ætiology. We already mentioned the link between his preliminary remarks (344-346) and the final passage of the song of Orpheus. Before the beginning of the narrative proper, the traditional invocation of the

Muse and the introductory mention of his attentive audience are couched in participles: "having invoked his mother's aid ... he sings to a spellbound audience" *admonita genetrice ... intentisque canit* (349-351). This is a first example of Valerius' technique of concentration. What had taken an entire line in Virgil (*Aen.* 2. 1 "All fell silent now and their faces were all attention"[1] *conticuere omnes intentique ora tenebant*) has been reduced to a single word, *intentis*.

While Ovid started with Jupiter's perspective, Flaccus views his story through the eyes of the men of old, and instead of describing an individual scene of seduction he talks in general terms: "Oft did our father see Jupiter come down to earth ... aflame for the coy Iasian maid"[2] *uidere priores / saepe Iouem in terras ... uirginis Iasiae blandos descendere ad ignes* (351-353); general and indirect as this statement is, it gains some colour through the oxymoron *blandos ignes*. In his introduction Valerius puts into a nutshell what Ovid had developed as an entire sequence of individual phases, as a process going on before his reader's eyes. We are surprised to learn that those men of old were evidently in a position to observe several visits of Jupiter with Io before Juno got wind of the affair; psychologically Ovid's version is more believable: given Juno's well-known mistrust and efficiency she must have discovered them the very first time. However, *saepe* is a setpiece of narrative introductions ("expositions"); frequently, some customary activity serves as a background to prepare an individual main action. It is Valerius' aim not to start the narrative proper before Juno enters the stage: "Juno, aware of his deceit and aglow with bridal fears, lept down from heaven" *sentit Iuno dolos curaque accensa iugali / aethere desiluit* (354-355). The intensity of the movements described by the poet increases significantly from *descendere* (353) to *desiluit* (355). The echo of Juno's jump spreads in ever growing circles. The ground and the cave begin to shake; Valerius gives the earthquake a moral interpretation: "The Lyrceian land and its bowers, their guilty secret known, trembled before the queen" *antraque deprensae tremuerunt conscia culpae* (356). It is true that we could simply translate: "The cave quaked which was the witness of the convicted guilt"; but in the present narrative there are more parallels between the physical and the moral spheres; hence we may conclude that they are part of the poet's design (cf. 374-375; 404-405; 409). Another connection

---

[1] Translation: C.Day Lewis (Oxford, 1952; paperback: New York, 1953).

[2] Translation: J.H.Mozley (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1934, several reprints).

between nature and human behaviour is stressed by Flaccus: after Orpheus' prayer, the favourable breeze which had accompanied the Argo definitely stayed with the ship (421-422).

The use of the title *domina* (355) for Juno shows, first of all, that she is the patroness of Argos, and that a sin against her is especially grievous; hence, the country certainly shares the conscience of guilt mentioned by Valerius. In a Roman context this would be a client's treason of his patron or a slave's of his lord. Here Juno is not the duped wife known from Roman comedy but an offended divinity whose appearance gives rise to fear[1] and trembling—of course, also on the part of Io, "the frightened paramour" *trepida ... paelex* (357). Here Flaccus adopts an especially meaningful word order: *trepida* is immediately connected with the previous sentence and describes Io's state of mind. Seen through the eyes of Io, her metamorphosis into a cow appears as a way of hiding, a notion which is graphically expressed in a bold hyperbaton: "She takes on the form of an Inachean heifer" ***Inachiae paelex subit ora iuuencae*** (357). The god, who caused the metamorphosis is mentioned only at the end of the sentence in an adverbial expression: "with the god's will" *sponte dei* (358). Unlike Ovid, who takes Jupiter's and Juno's points of view, Flaccus sympathizes with the victim by making Io the grammatical subject. Even at the end of the story (416-417) he will get into her spirit ("All this from Pharos' height afar Io beholds" *haec procul Io / spectat ab arce*), and indirectly conveying her triumph to the reader.

Flaccus' Juno goes one step further than Ovid's: not satisfied to praise the cow, she even pets and strokes it (358). Valerius makes the reader feel Io's loathing for this caress and thus turns. Ovid's comedy of the gods into an appalling scene full of hypocrisy. To convey the idea of duplicity Flaccus does not use humorous appositions loosely appended to the sentence, but, instead, ironically yokes together participles, which take on an almost Tacitean ring: "Stifling her own sighs beneath a smiling countenance" *Iuno renidenti cohibens suspiria uultu* (359). Compared to such an expression, even Sallust's antitheses look rather straightforward: "To lock up in their hearts something other than they confessed with their tongues"[2] *aliud clausum in*

---

[1] On the vocabulary of fear in Flaccus cf. O.Perderzani, "*Curiositas* e classicismo nelle *Argonautiche* di Valerio Flacco", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 18 (1987): 101-129; earlier: A.Ernout, "*Metus-Timor.* Les formes en *-us* et en *-os* (-or) du latin, in: *Philologica* II (Paris, 1957): 7-56.

[2] Translation: N.Adkin, in: M.von Albrecht, *Masters of Roman Prose* (Leeds, 1989): 68.

pectore, aliud in lingua promptum habere, ... magisque uoltum quam ingenium bonum habere (*Catil.* 10. 5).[1] Virgil, too, had clearly separated the opposites: "He wore a confident look and kept his troubles to himself"[2] ***spem** uoltu simulat, premit altum corde **dolorem*** (*Aen.* 1. 209).

Flaccus omits the skirmish of questions and subterfuges and resolutely hurries towards his goal: "Then she accosts Jove thus" *mox ita adorta Iouem* (360). The military metaphor reveals that Juno takes the offensive (cf. also 1. 694). While Ovid had just briefly mentioned Juno's request, Valerius develops it into the first and longest direct speech of the episode, outfitting it with ironical undertones: "Give her as a gift to thy dear bride" *da carae munera nuptae* (362). Given the situation, the adjective "untamed" *indomitam* (*bouem*) sounds highly ironical. An especially sarcastic touch is Juno's promise to provide personally an adequate pasture for the beloved animal (*dilectae pecudi* 363). This is the height of hypocrisy: cruel torture under the mask of care for a creature which is actually Juno's sacred animal!

Thus, it happens that the entire scene becomes more ironical and much less humorous—in full accordance with Valerius' intentions. Nor does Flaccus develop Jupiter's dilemma into a long chain of antitheses; instead he puts it into a nutshell: "What ruse could Jove find to say her nay? what trickery, once found, could he have maintained?" *qua fraude negaret / aut quos inuentos tenuisset Iuppiter astus* (364-365). This expression bears the stamp of Flaccus' preference for synonyms;[3] he avoids the word *dolos* which he had used in 354. Although the manuscript tradition has *inuentus timuisset*, the conjecture of Harless must be preferred: what ruse could Jupiter have maintained even if he had found one? (This is an allusion to Jupiter's perjury as reported in Hesiod. If he had said that he had never touched Io, this would have been belied at the latest when his son Epaphus was born.) The manuscript reading *inuentus* would degrade Flaccus' text to the level of comedy, an effect which would be contrary to his intentions. Moreover, the text of Harless forms a meaningful climax as compared to *qua fraude negaret.*

Juno's reaction evinces the speed typical of that goddess. She appoints Argus at once (*protinus* 366), not after a painful period full of jealousy. With a scientist's technical interest Ovid had described

---

1 Cf. also several Tacitean expressions (*Ann.* 6. 50).

2 Translation: C.Day Lewis (Oxford, 1952; paperback: New York, 1953).

3 Here, *fraus* means something like "grudge"; it is not a precise synonym of *dolus.*

how the eyes of Argus worked and how they changed guard (625-629); Valerius, however, is satisfied with an impressionistic simile, which is recherché to the point of obscuring rather than illustrating the matter in question: "Everywhere on his head are sleepless eyes as though a Lydean bride should bedeck her web with flecks of purple" (368-369); this description is perhaps inspired by the visual arts.

Since Flaccus shuns triviality, he says nothing about the cow's daily life under the protection of Argus; instead he enhances what is frightening and unfamiliar: "At Argus' bidding must she go on paths unknown, over rocks, through monster-haunted wilds" *et in scopulos et monstris horrida lustra / ignotas iubet ire uias* (370-371). Here the poet shows his ability to have the reader discover familiar things as if he saw them for the first time. Similarly, in a memorable passage Valerius had described the fears of the Argonauts who on their new ship sailed through the darkness of night for the first time (2. 34-47). Valerius has a poet's eye for the intensity of first experiences. On the other hand, he keeps his descriptions within the limits of nature and does not raise the problem of Io's new identity to the level of Ovid's desperate paradoxes which border on the Kafkaesque. Did he think that Ovid had completely exhausted this theme? Instead he used two present participles which, with Italian vivacity and gesticulation, convey the fruitlessness of her attempts: "tarrying oft, alas! and struggling with prayers" *multa morantem / conantemque preces* (371-372).[1] Valerius, who is adverse to theatrical effects, skips Io's encounter with her sister and her father, her recognition by means of letters traced in the sand and her father's moving complaint, and when Io takes leave from her father's beach, she kisses it instead of his hand (*palmis*: Ovid, 646). Once more, therefore, the younger poet prefers to show a natural aspect of the river rather than stressing his anthropomorphic features (Valerius Flaccus, 373).

The complaint of the fountains, however, is dominated by sonorous anaphoras reminiscent of Virgil's *Tenth Eclogue*. Valerius, therefore, projects human feelings into nature as he had done at the beginning of the story. The fountains, in a sense, take over the role of Io's sisters, though with only one exception (375), there are no strictly anthropomorphic elements.

[1] The pattern is Virgilian, cf. *Georg.* 4. 501: *prensantem nequiquam umbras et multa uolentem / dicere*; *Aen.* 2. 790-791: *lacrimantem et multa uolentem / dicere*; 4. 390-391: *multa metu cunctantem et multa uolentem / dicere.*

While Ovid had mentioned Io's wanderings only briefly, Flaccus dwells on them and enriches his description with details omitted until now: Io sleeps on a hard bed (380; cf. Ovid 633), she drinks dirty water (379; Ovid 634; here Flaccus softens Ovid's naturalism), and she eats crude food (379; Ovid 632). Anaphoric repetitions of interrogative pronouns (*ubi, quos, quae*) and interjections (*heu!* 371; 378) add to the emotional impact of this passage. In such a lofty context details like Ovid's "muddy water" and "bitter grass" would be out of place. Instead, Valerius builds up a gradation to form a powerful crescendo: Io is horrified by the whip. Here the poet appeals to the sense of touch (remember Juno's caress in 358), and the sequence of tortures finally leads to an attempt at suicide,[1] which is cruelly thwarted by Argus (*durus seruauit* 383). Whereas Ovid indulged in oxymora and serenely glossed over the antinomies of human existence, Valerius reveals the abysses of human cruelty. Ovid had not ignored this sphere either but commented on it in a more detached tone.

Flaccus interrupts his artful gradation of sufferings by introducing an element of surprise: all of a sudden we hear Mercury's flute and only later, by means of an appended participle, we are informed about his mission. While Ovid had presented an uninterrupted chain of events Valerius confronts us with a surprise and then adds a retrospective explanation in which the idea of "haste" is expressed in many ways: *celerans* (385), cf. *desiluit* (355), *protinus* (366), *subito* (384), *celerem* (390), *recurrit* (395), *raptatur* (402). In Ovid, Argus is enthralled by Mercury's music and invites the god to stay with him; in Valerius, strangely enough, Mercury simply orders Argus to pay attention. Is Valerius suggesting a scene of magic enchantment reminiscent of the song of the Sirenes (*Odyssey* 12, 184 ff.) or is he mocking a certain musical emperor of his century who gave public performances and punished unattentive listeners who had fallen asleep? The magic effect is powerfully embodied in the participles *languentia* and *sequentia* (which take parallel positions in two subsequent lines: 388-389) as well as in the closing *iam - iam* (388) which has been brilliantly restored by Baehrens. Significantly Valerius avoids Ovid's conspicuous final rhyme (682-683 *loquendo, canendo*) which had underlined a crystal clear sentence structure. In Valerius only the penultimate words rhyme. He also embeds the surprising deathblow within

---

[1] Cf. Aeschylus, *Prometheus* 747-748.

Mercury's song; the stylistic hyperbaton stresses the self-contained character of the line and the simultaneity of the two events: "And in the midst of his song out he flashes his swift blade" *et celerem mediis in cantibus exigit harpen* (390)—an example of the "bitonality" cherished by Flaccus.

Here a caesura follows: Io begins to regain her old shape, and it looks as if Juno has been conquered; in fact, the words *uictrix Iunonis* (392) hold a prominent position at the end of the sentence. But in this moment of victory a sudden change occurs: *at ecce /... Tisiphonen uidet* (392-393). Unlike Ovid, Valerius here introduces a retrograde metamorphosis which in turn is annulled at once by an unexpected obstacle (395). Valerius exacerbates Io's sufferings while trying at the same time to outdo Ovid by a double metamorphosis which marks the *peripeteia.*

Tisiphone's appearance is no less sudden and unexpected than Mercury's. As there is no mention of Juno sending the Erinys, it is up to the reader to guess it from the context (cf. the ironical innuendo *uictrix Iunonis*). Valerius thus gives his narrative a surprising turn. The word order reflects a psychological process: Io gets gradually aware of details (392): *et ecce - cum facibus - flagrisque - et Tartareo ululatu;* only at the end does the terrible name appear: *Tisiphonen uidet.* Twice the ends of the lines form effective rhetorical pauses, first after *ecce,* then before the proper name, and the word *ac,* placed before the caesura, is indicative of Io's panic. The retrograde metamorphosis is figured as a new form of flight: "And passes once again into the shape of a hapless heifer" *et in miserae rursus bouis ora recurrit* (395). Io is totally bewildered: "Nor bethinks her in what vale or on what height to stay her steps" *nec qua ualle memor nec quo se uertice sistat* (396). To intensify the picture of Io's misery Valerius tries to outdo a famous Virgilian passage: "wandering she comes even to the waters of Inachus, how faring and how changed from that first heifer that she was" *Inachias errore etiam defertur ad undas / qualis et a prima quantum mutata iuuenca* (397-398 cf. Virgil *Aeneid* 2. 274-275: "Oh, what a sight he was! How terribly changed from the Hector who ..." *ei mihi qualis erat, quantum mutatus ab illo / Hectore*). In fact, Io is doubly humiliated: first she is changed into a cow; then she becomes so unhappy that even her former state as a cow seems preferable. Only now does Valerius remember her father and her sisters ("Nor do her father or the frightened nymphs try to draw nigh her" *nec pater aut trepidae temptant accedere nymphae* 399). Yet, while in Ovid this motif had enhanced the

emotional appeal, in Valerius it serves a new purpose, to stress the pathos of solitude. Even her closest relatives leave her alone; they are *trepidae* (399; the same word had been used in 357 at Juno's arrival). Clearly, divine anger has intimidated them. Such were the experiences of the imperial period.

Once more Io is seen fleeing through the wilderness. A hyperbolic expression marks her estrangement ("fleeing from that dear head as from hateful Styx" *ceu Styga dilectum fugiens caput* 401): her beloved father's source fills her with infernal horror. The detail, though tragic, not humorous, is couched in epigrammatic language.

The entire description of Io's wanderings has been added by Valerius (perhaps from another source). The same is true of the ending when Io plunges into the sea (Flaccus uses *donec* to introduce the last turn of events). The floods, however, let her pass (404-405): "The waves part and the sea, for knowing the future, yields her timid steps a path" *absistunt fluctus et gnara futuri / dant pauidae alta uiam. Pauidae* is a humanist's conjecture; perhaps we should retain *pauida* which is the reading of V and is in perfect harmony with Flaccus' permanent effort to fill nature with life and lend it feelings. In fact, the notion that the sea knows the future is introduced by Valerius on several other occasions: the prophetess Polyxo plunges into the sea in order to learn the will of the gods (2. 316-321); many divinities of the water have prophetic gifts, among them, Proteus (*Odyss.* 4. 349), Eidothea (*Odyss.* 4. 366) and the nymphs. Of course, to the latter belong the Muses and the Sibyls, whose oracles Valerius studied as a *quindecimuir sacris faciundis.* It is no wonder that he, as a poet, attributes to nature a dim inkling of divine will. A graphic description of Io walking through the sea (405-406) forms the conclusion of the paragraph describing her wanderings.

Tisiphone hurries on ahead to prevent Io from setting foot on the mainland of Egypt, but the majestic Nile flushes away the Fury. Once again the description is rich in picturesque detail: "Here and there are seen her brands and whips far scattered, and the serpents shaken from her dishevelled hair" *apparent sparsaeque faces disiectaque longe / uerbera et abruptis excussi crinibus hydri* (412-413). It is not by chance that this passage is reminiscent of the shipwreck in *Aeneid* 1 (118).[1]

[1] Aeneas' shipwreck had been ultimately caused by Juno (whose allies were Aeolus in *Aeneid* 1 and a Fury in *Aeneid* 7). In Flaccus it is ironically Juno's Fury who suffers a "shipwreck". This is an intentional reversal of the situations of *Aeneid* 1 and *Aeneid* 7 (which are parallelled by Virgil).

With a peal of thunder, Jupiter finally acknowledges his love (*curamque fatetur* 415 as opposed to 364). Flaccus seizes the opportunity to exalt the god's dignity, a point to which, from the beginning, he attached greater importance than Ovid had done. Consequently, his Jupiter does not flatter Juno but stands on his kingly rights, "Juno herself quails before his word" *atque ipsa imperium Iuno pauet* (416), and it is no longer Io, but now Juno who is afraid; Io, once a victim, becomes a dignified onlooker. During the battle her apotheosis is already viewed as a *fait accompli*; in fact, the penultimate and the last paragraphs overlap. Valerius gives more prominence to this apotheosis than Ovid had done who in this story barely mentioned the cult of Isis. Flaccus' Io is aware of her being exalted; it is her perspective which matters up to the end. A pictorial vignette concludes the scene: Io with a serpent in her hair and the sistrum in her hand. This technique, which is reminiscent of the picture of Deo at the end of Theocritus' *Seventh Idyll*, reflects Valerius' "Hellenistic" craftsmanship, which is also confirmed by the ætiological framework he gave to the Io-story. Finally Orpheus comes back to the *aition* of the name of Bosporus and asks the goddess to grant the Argonauts a safe passage through it.

Flaccus versus Ovid

What conclusions can be drawn from our evidence? Valerius' narrative is shorter than Ovid's: he omits the initial love scene and large parts of the comedy of Jupiter und Juno; he considerably cuts down Ovid's detailed and repetitive description of Io's estrangement from her former self and her inability to express herself; he sacrifices the syrinx episode and Io's moving encounter with her father and her sisters (nor does the father's grief form the frame of the narrative, a change which is owing to Valerius' preference for "ætiological" links); even the dramatic scene of recognition and the rhetorical lament of the father are missing, and details from Io's daily life are omitted or given a more dignified expression. Flaccus, it should be noted, also enhances Jupiter's majesty and the awesome impact of gods on men. All of this results from a convergence of the author's religious feeling, his Roman sense of dignity and his striving for an "epic" style (*per aspera ad astra*, cf. 5. 154-176).

Flaccus' additions serve the same purpose. His detailed description of Io's wanderings and his insistence on her solitude conspire to

create an appalling atmosphere. The sublimity of the gods is enhanced[1] in the divine battle between Nilus and Tisiphone, in Jupiter's majestic orders, and in his acknowledgement of Io. The final apotheosis is also given greater prominence in Valerius than in Ovid. Flaccus insists on the contrast between her humiliation and her exaltation. In Ovid, the human longing for acknowledgement comes back in the next generation (cf. the quarrel between Epaphus and Phaethon).

Let us now turn to the form of the narrative. Ovid's narrative exhibits more continuity than Flaccus' does; there is an uninterrupted chain of events, which are presented vividly and graphically.

Valerius gives proof of his striving for independence by transposing some elements into other contexts and by developing details neglected by Ovid. To give an example, the retrograde metamorphosis does not appear at the end of the story, where it would have no dramatic function worth mentioning; instead, it is transposed to the moment of *peripeteia*. Here, Flaccus shows some dramatic inventiveness of his own. Elsewhere, too, he rearranges motifs to form a climax and to introduce new features (such as Io's attempted suicide or the distrust of her relatives). Valerius also concentrates graphic elements to form impressive final vignettes (Io as a cow in the sea; Tisiphone's scattered utensils; Io with the attributes of Isis).

Typical of Flaccus' narrative technique are elements of surprise. In the episode under consideration there are two unprepared events for which the poet gives either an explanation later or none at all. Passages like the sudden appearance of Mercury or of Tisiphone also show that Valerius expects his readers to know Ovid's story. And, if Ovid, when compared to his immediate contemporaries, seems more "modern", the same is true of Flaccus when compared to Ovid. Hence, in our context the "classical" aspects of Ovid are thrown into relief, a result partly owing to the conditions of our test.

---

[1] On Jupiter in Valerius Flaccus: W.Schubert, Jupiter in den Epen der Flavierzeit (Frankfurt, 1984): esp. 292-299; D.C.Feeney, *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford, 1991): 327-328, rightly stresses the fact that Valerius' religious ideas enabled him to shape a consistent divine action, in contrast to Ovid's incalculable and irresponsible gods. The Argo is a prophetic ship, it acts in accordance with Jupiter (who directs universal history) and the prophetic poet (who tells the story of the Argonauts, an important chapter of history). Against this background, G.B.Conte's verdict saying that the Flavian epic poets do not interpret history turns out to be rash and perfunctory (G.B.Conte, *Memoria dei poeti i sistema letterario* [Torino, 1974, 2nd ed. 1985]: 104); see now M.Wacht, "Juppiters Weltplan im Epos des Valerius Flaccus, *AAWM* 10 (1991): 1-33.

It is on the level of style that Valerius' intentions are most evident. Here, two aspects deserve special mention, the different function of epigrammatic "points" and the use of participles. In Ovid, rhetorical and epigrammatic "points" are more playful than in Flaccus, who uses them more exclusively to express tragic and ironical feelings. Valerius' style serves to reveal the simultaneous presence of different levels of thought in a single sentence. His use of participles may serve as a paradigm. Classical poetic language had not been particularly rich in participial constructions; in the course of Cicero's life, for example, participles became more frequent in his prose writings, while rarer in his poems.[1] In classical poetry, sentences are generally coordinated rather than subordinated. For all the refinement of imagery and ideas, in the field of syntax there is a striving for clarity and simplicity. In this regard Ovid is an immediate heir of the classics. His use of participles is typical of the lucidity of his poetic sentence structure. Participles are not very frequent in Ovid and abound only at climactic points.

In the narrative under consideration Ovid uses 30 past participles and 16 present participles; altogether there are 46 participles in 164 lines. Valerius uses 23 present participles and 21 past participles; altogether 44 participles in 78 lines. If we take into account the number of lines, participles are twice as frequent in Valerius' Io narrative (0.56) as they are in Ovid's (0.27). Present participles are even three times as frequent in Valerius (0.269 : 0.0976).

This may serve as a yardstick to measure the originality of Flaccus' poetic syntax. Moreover, it confirms in terms of quantity the observations we made concerning the qualities of this poet's style. Even as far as syntax is concerned Valerius finds a way of his own. Although he takes classics like Virgil and Ovid as his points of departure, he ultimately considerably deviates from them. Being an admirer of Virgil he is modest enough to choose an inconspicuous domain, that of the participle, to prove his creativity. As we have shown, participles allowed him to develop a tense and polyphonic diction which was in harmony with the experiences of his age and to some degree anticipated the ironical style of Tacitus.

In some respects Ovid is justly considered an ancestor of imperial poetry. If we compare him to Valerius, we discover some evidence,

---

[1] A.Traglia, *La lingua di Cicerone poeta* (Bari, 1950): 70-73; E.Laughton, *The Participle in Cicero* (Oxford, 1964): 54; M.von Albrecht "M.Tullius Cicero. Sprache und Stil", *RE*, Suppl. 13 (1973): col. 1319.

which seems to corroborate this view (e.g. his search for "pointed" expressions or the attention he pays to Isis and Hercules); though, even here, differences should not be neglected. On the other hand, a study of his poetic syntax throws into relief what is "classical" and "Augustan" in Ovid, whom Hermann Fränkel[1] duly called a "poet between two worlds".

Epilogue: What aspects of rhetoric and intertextuality are discernible in our texts? Ovid's text abounds in aphorisms redolent of Augustan rhetorical schools and playfully foreshadows Lucan's tragic oratory. Even when describing mixed feelings Ovid strives for graceful clarity of sentence structure (thus representing what is called in rhetoric "smooth" or "florid composition")[2] whereas Valerius Flaccus reflects complex psychology in a closely-knit, even intricate syntax and thus paves the way for Tacitus, who would become, along with Pindar, Thucydides, and Sallust, the embodiment of "austere composition". Flaccus, who knew his rhetoric, consciously opposed his own dignified style to Ovid's, trying to outdo him not only in austerity but also in brevity and speed (*breuitas* and *uelocitas* were qualities admired in Tacitus' model, Sallust: Quint. 10. 1. 32; 10. 1. 102). In this case, rhetorical categories allow us to capture the stylistic intentions of our poets in terms which were familiar to them.

Intertextual relationships (in the narrower sense of the word) put into evidence a fundamental diversity of artistic intentions and authors' attitudes: Ovid meeting his readers where they are, Valerius summoning them to rise to his level. As for "intertextual" relationships in the broader sense of the word, Valerius' text conveys intriguing crossings of generic categories: he transposes Ovid's rather "secular" story into a more solemn, "Virgilian", framework. We may add that, on the even larger scale of intercultural exchange, he does the same with the entire myth of the Argonauts. By assimilating a Greek myth through the prism of the *Aeneid*, he gives his Roman public a new awareness of its "Greek ancestry" and a new, Græco-Roman, identity which consists, as it were, of an "Old" and a "New Testament".

---

[1] H.Fränkel, *Ovid, A Poet between Two Worlds* (Berkeley, 1945).

[2] A.Scaglione, *The Classical Theory of Composition. From its Origins to the Present. A Historical Survey* (Chapel Hill, 1972).

CHAPTER ELEVEN

STATIUS

The Futility of Rhetoric. *Achilles under the Spell of Beauty* (Achilleid *1. 242-396*)

Iam premit astra dies humilique ex aequore Titan
rorantes euoluit equos et ab aethere magno
sublatum curru pelagus cadit, at uada mater
Scyria iamdudum fluctus emensa tenebat,
exierantque iugo fessi delphines erili:
cum pueri tremefacta quies oculique patentes
infusum sensere diem. stupet aëre primo,
quae loca, qui fluctus, ubi Pelion? omnia uersa
atque ignota uidet dubitatque agnoscere matrem.
occupat illa manu blandeque adfata pauentem:
"si mihi, care puer, thalamos sors aequa tulisset,
quos dabat, aetheriis ego te complexa tenerem
sidus grande plagis, magnique puerpera caeli
nil humilis Parcas terrenaque fata uererer.
nunc impar tibi, nate, genus, praeclusaque leti
tantum a matre uia est; quin et metuenda propinquant
tempora et extremis admota pericula metis.
cedamus, paulumque animos submitte uiriles
atque habitus dignare meos. si Lydia dura
pensa manu mollesque tulit Tirynthius hastas,
si decet aurata Bacchum uestigia palla
uerrere, uirgineos si Iuppiter induit artus,
nec magnum ambigui fregerunt Caenea sexus:
hac sine, quaeso, minas nubemque exire malignam.
mox iterum campos, iterum Centaurica reddam
lustra tibi: per ego hoc decus et uentura iuuentae
gaudia, si terras humilemque experta maritum
te propter, si progenitum Stygos amne seuero
armaui—totumque utinam! -, cape tuta parumper
tegmina nil nocitura animo. cur ora reducis
quidue parant oculi? pudet hoc mitescere cultu?
per te, care puer, cognata per aequora iuro,
nesciet hoc Chiron." sic horrida pectora tractat
nequiquam mulcens; obstat genitorque roganti
nutritorque ingens et cruda exordia magnae
indolis. effrenae tumidum uelut igne iuuentae
si quis equum primis submittere temptet habenis:
ille diu campis fluuiisque et honore superbo

gauisus non colla iugo, non aspera praebet
ora lupis dominique fremit captiuus inire
imperia atque alios miratur discere cursus.
quis deus attonitae fraudes astumque parenti
contulit? indocilem quae mens detraxit Achillem?
Palladi litoreae celebrabat Scyros honorum
forte diem, placidoque satae Lycomede sorores
luce sacra patriis, quae rara licentia, muris
exierant dare ueris opes diuaeque seueras
fronde ligare comas et spargere floribus hastam.
omnibus eximium formae decus, omnibus idem
cultus et expleto teneri iam fine pudoris
uirginitas matura toris annique tumentes.
sed quantum uirides pelagi Venus addita Nymphas
obruit, aut umeris quantum Diana relinquit
Naidas, effulget tantum regina decori
Deidamia chori pulchrisque sororibus obstat.
illius et roseo flammatur purpura uultu
et gemmis lux maior inest et blandius aurum:
atque ipsi par forma deae est, si pectoris angues
ponat et exempta pacetur casside uultus.
hanc ubi ducentem longe socia agmina uidit,
trux puer et nullo temeratus pectora motu
deriguit totisque nouum bibit ossibus ignem.
nec latet haustus amor, sed fax uibrata medullis
in uultus atque ora redit lucemque genarum
tingit et impulsum tenui sudore pererrat.
lactea Massagetae ueluti cum pocula fuscant
sanguine puniceo uel ebur corrumpitur ostro:
sic uariis manifesta notis—palletque rubetque—
flamma repens. eat atque ultro ferus hospita sacra
disiciat turbae securus et immemor aeui,
ni pudor et iunctae teneat reuerentia matris.
ut pater armenti quondam ductorque futurus,
cui nondum toto peraguntur cornua gyro,
cum sociam pastus niueo candore iuuencam
aspicit, ardescunt animi primusque per ora
spumat amor, spectant hilares obstantque magistri.
occupat arrepto iam conscia tempore mater:
"hasne inter simulare choros et bracchia ludo
nectere, nate, graue est? gelida quid tale sub Ossa
Peliacisque iugis? o si mihi iungere curas
atque alium portare sinu contingat Achillen!"
mulcetur laetumque rubet uisusque proteruos
obliquat uestesque manu leuiore repellit.
aspicit ambiguum genetrix cogique uolentem
iniecitque sinus; tum colla rigentia mollit
submittitque graues umeros et fortia laxat
bracchia et impexos certo domat ordine crines
ac sua dilecta ceruice monilia transfert;

et picturato cohibens uestigia limbo
incessum motumque docet fandique pudorem.
qualiter artifici uicturae pollice cerae
accipiunt formas ignemque manumque sequuntur:
talis erat diuae natum mutantis imago.
nec luctata diu; superest nam plurimis illi
inuita uirtute decor, fallitque tuentes
ambiguus tenuique latens discrimine sexus.
procedunt, iterumque monens iterumque fatigans
blanda Thetis: "sic ergo gradum, sic ora manusque,
nate, feres comitesque modis imitabere fictis,
ne te suspectum molli non misceat aulae
rector et incepti pereant mendacia furti."
dicit et admoto non distat comere tactu.
sic ubi uirgineis Hecate lassata Therapnis
ad patrem fratremque redit, comes haeret eunti
mater et ipsa umeros exsertaque bracchia uelat;
ipsa arcum pharetrasque locat uestemque latentem
deducit sparsosque tumet componere crines.
protinus adgreditur regem atque ibi testibus aris
"hanc tibi," ait, "nostri germanam, rector, Achillis
- nonne uides, ut torua genas aequandaque fratri?—
tradimus: arma umeris arcumque animosa petebat
ferre et Amazonio conubia pellere ritu.
sed mihi curarum satis est pro stirpe uirili:
haec calathos et sacra ferat, tu frange regendo
indocilem sexuque tene, dum nubilis aetas
soluendusque pudor; neue exercere proteruas
gymnadas aut lustris nemorum concede uagari.
intus ale et similes inter seclude puellas;
litore praecipue portuque arcere memento.
uidisti modo uela Phrygum: iam mutua iura
fallere transmissae pelago didicere carinae."
accedit dictis pater ingenioque parentis
occultum Aeaciden—quis diuum fraudibus obstet?—
accipit; ultro etiam ueneratur supplice dextra
et grates electus agit: nec turba piarum
Scyriadum cessat nimio defigere uisu
uirginis ora nouae, quantum ceruice comisque
emineat quantumque umeros ac pectora fundat.
dehinc sociare choros castisque accedere sacris
hortantur, ceduntque loco et contingere gaudent.
qualiter Idaliae uolucres, ubi mollia frangunt
nubila, iam longum caeloque domoque gregatae,
si iunxit pinnas diuersoque hospita tractu
uenit auis, cunctae primum mirantur et horrent:
mox propius propiusque uolant, atque aëre in ipso
paulatim fecere suam plausuque secundo
circueunt hilares et ad alta cubilia ducunt.
digreditur multum cunctata in limine mater,

dum repetit monitus arcanaque murmura figit
auribus et tacito dat uerba nouissima uultu.
tunc excepta freto longe ceruice reflexa
abnatat et blandis adfatur litora uotis:
"cara mihi tellus, magnae cui pignora curae
depositumque ingens timido commisimus astu,
sis felix taceasque, precor, quo more tacebat
Creta Rheae: te longus honos aeternaque cingent
templa nec instabili fama superabere Delo;
et uentis et sacra fretis interque uadosas
Cycladas, Aegaeae frangunt ubi saxa procellae,
Nereidum tranquilla domus iurandaque nautis
insula, ne solum Danaas admitte carinas,
ne, precor! hic thiasi tantum et nihil utile bellis,
- hoc famam narrare doce—dumque arma parantur
Dorica et alternum Mauors interfurit orbem,
- cedo equidem—sit uirgo pii Lycomedis Achilles."

Now[1] day o'erwhelms the stars, and from the low and level main Titan wheels heavenward his dripping steeds, and down from the expanse of air falls the sea that the chariot bore up; but long since had the mother (245) traversed the waves and gained the Scyrian shores, and the weary dolphins had been loosed from their mistress' yoke: when the boy's sleep was stirred, and his opening eyes grew conscious of the inpouring day. In amaze at the light that greets him he asks, where is he, what are these waves, where is Pelion? All he beholds is different (250) and unknown, and he hesitates to recognize his mother. Quickly she caresses him and soothes his fear: "If, dear lad, a kindly lot had brought me the wedlock that it offered, in the fields of heaven should I be holding thee, a glorious star, in my embrace, nor a celestial mother (255) should I fear the lowly Fates or the destinies of earth. But now unequal is thy birth, my son, and only on thy mother's side is the way of death barred for thee; moreover, times of terror draw nigh, and peril hovers about the utmost goal. Retire we then, relax awhile thy mighty spirit, (260) and scorn not this raiment of mine. If the Tirynthian took in his rough hand Lydian wool and women's wands, if it becomes Bacchus to trail a gold-embroidered robe behind him, if Jupiter put on a woman's form, and doubtful sex weakened not the mighty Caeneus, (265) this way, I entreat thee, suffer me to escape the threatening, baleful cloud. Soon will I restore thy plains and the fields where the Centaurs roam: by this beauty of thine and the coming joys of youth I pray thee, if for thy sake I endured the

[1] Translation adapted from: Statius, ed. and transl. by J.H.Mozley (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1928; repr. 1961). The present chapter is dedicated to Gareth Schmeling; it was written, as most of the chapters of this book, during a stay at the University of Florida, Gainesville, in 1986/87. I am glad to see that some of my points (e.g., Statius' closeness to Ovid) are now confirmed, from a different point of view, by S.Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998), esp. 135-144 (with further bibliography) and by G.Rosati, "Momenti e forme della fortuna antica di Ovidio: l'*Achilleide* di Stazio", in: M.Picone, B.Zimmermann (eds.), *Ovidius redivivus. Von Ovid zu Dante* (Stuttgart, 1994): 43-62.

earth and an inglorious mate, if at thy birth I fortified thee with the stern waters of Styx (270)—ay, would I had wholly!—take these safe robes awhile, they will in no wise harm thy valour. Why dost thou turn away? What means that glance? Art thou ashamed to soften thee in this garb? Dear lad, I swear it by my kindred waters, Chiron shall know nought of this." So doth she work on his rough heart, (275) vainly cajoling; the thought of his sire and his great teacher oppose her prayer and the rude beginnings of his mighty spirit. Even so, should one try to subdue with earliest rein a horse full of the mettlesome fire of ungoverned youth, he having long delighted in stream and meadow and his own proud beauty, (280) gives not his neck to the yoke, nor his fierce mouth to the bridle, and snorts with rage at passing beneath a master's sway and marvels that he learns another gait.

What god endued the despairing mother with fraud and cunning? What device drew Achilles from his stubborn purpose? (285) It chanced that Scyros was keeping festal day in honour of Pallas, guardian of the shore, and that the sisters, offspring of peace-loving Lycomedes, had on this sacred morn gone forth from their native town—a licence rarely given—to pay tribute of the spring, and bind their grave tresses with the leaf of the goddess and scatter flowers upon her spear. (290) All were of rarest beauty, all clad alike and all in lusty youth, their years of girlish modesty now ended, and maidenhood ripe for the marriage-couch. But as far as Venus by comparison doth surpass the green Nymphs of the sea, or as Diana rises taller by head and shoulders (295) than the Naiads, so doth Deidamia, queen of the lovely choir, outshine and dazzle her fair sisters. The bright colour flames upon her rosy countenance, a more brilliant light is in her jewels, the gold has a more alluring gleam;[1] as beauteous were the goddess herself, would she but lay aside the serpents on her breast, (300) and doff her helm and pacify her brow. When he beheld her far in advance of her attendant train, the lad, ungentle as he was and heart-whole from any touch of passion, stood spellbound and drank in strange fire through all his frame. Nor does the love he was imbibed lie hidden, but the flame pulsating in his inmost being (305) returns to his face and colours the glow upon his cheeks, and as he feels its power runs o'er his body with a light sweat. As when the Massagetae darken milk-white bowls with blood-red dye, or ivory is stained with purple, so by varying signs of blush and pallor (310) does the sudden fire betray its presence. He would rush forward and unprovoked fiercely break up the ceremonies of his hosts, reckless of the crowd and forgetful of his years, did not shame restrain him and awe of the mother by his side. As when a bullock, soon to be the sire and leader of a herd, though his horns have not yet come full circle, (315) perceives a heifer of snowy whiteness, the comrade of his pasture, his spirit takes fire, and he foams at the mouth with his first passion; glad at heart the herdsmen watch him and check his fury.

Seizing the moment his mother purposely accosts him: "Is it too hard a thing, my son, to make pretence of dancing (320) and join hands in sport among these maidens? Hast thou aught such neath Ossa and the crags of

---

[1] I prefer the following sentence construction: "Purple is burning on her rosy face, a light greater than that of jewels is in her (eyes) and gold of a more alluring gleam".

Pelion? O, if it were my lot to match two loving hearts, and to bear another Achilles in my arms!" He is softened, and blushes for joy, and with sly and sidelong glance repels the robes less certainly. (325) His mother sees him in doubt and willing to be compelled, and casts the raiment o'er him; then she softens his stalwart neck and bows his strong shoulders, and relaxes the muscles of his arms, and tames and orders duly his uncombed tresses, and sets her own necklace about the neck she loves; (330) then keeping his step within the embroidered skirt she teaches him gait and motion and modesty of speech. Even as the waxen images that the artist's thumb will make to live take form and follow the fire and the hand that carves them, such was the picture of the goddess as she transformed her son. (335) Nor did she struggle long; for plenteous charm remains to him though his manhood brook it not, and he baffles beholders by the puzzle of his sex that by a narrow margin hides its secret.

They go forward, and Thetis unsparingly plies her counsels and persuasive words: "Thus then, my son, must thou manage thy gait, thus thy features and thy hands, (340) and imitate thy comrades and counterfeit their ways, lest the king suspect thee and admit thee not to the women's chambers, and the crafty cunning of our enterprise be lost." So speaking she delays not to put correcting touches to his attire. Thus when Hecate returns wearied to her sire and brother from Therapnae, (345) haunt of maidens, her mother bears her company as she goes, and with her own hand covers her shoulders and bared arms, herself arranges the bow and quiver, and pulls down the girt-up robe, and is proud to trim the disordered tresses.

Straightway she accosts the monarch, and there in the presence of the altars: (350) "Here, O king," she says, "I present to thee the sister of my Achilles—seest thou not how proud her glance and like her brother's?—so high her spirit, she begged for arms and a bow to carry on her shoulders, and like an Amazon to spurn the thought of wedlock. But my son is enough care for me; (355) let her carry the baskets at the sacrifice, do thou control and tame her wilfulness, and keep her to her sex, till the time for marriage come and the end of her maiden modesty; nor suffer her to engage in wanton wrestling-matches, nor to frequent the woodland haunts. Bring her up indoors, in seclusion among girls of her own age; (360) above all remember to keep her from the harbour and the shore. Lately thou sawest the Phrygian sails: already ships that have crossed the sea have learnt treason to mutual loyalties."

The sire accedes to her words, and receives the disguised Achilles by his mother's ruse—who can resist when gods deceive? (365) Nay more, he venerates her with a suppliant's hand, and gives thanks that he was chosen; nor is the band of duteous Scyrian maidens slow to dart keen glances at the face of their new comrade, how she o'ertops them by head and neck, how broad her expanse of breast and shoulders; (370) then they invite her to join the dance and approach the holy rites, and make room for her in their ranks and rejoice to be near her. Just as Idalian birds, cleaving the soft clouds and long since gathered in the sky or in their homes, if a strange bird from some distant region (375) has joined them wing to wing, are at first all filled with amaze and fear; then nearer and nearer they fly, and while yet in the air have made him one of them and hover joyfully around with favouring beat of pinions and lead him to their lofty resting-places. Long,

ere she departs, lingers the mother at the gate, (380) while she repeats advice and implants whispered secrets in his ear and in hushed tones gives her last counsels. Then she plunges into the main, and gazing back swims far away, and entreats with flattering prayers the island-shore: "O land that I love, to whom by timid cunning (385) I have committed the pledge of my anxious care, a trust that is great indeed, mayst thou prosper and be silent, I beg, as Crete was silent for Rhea; enduring honour and everlasting shrines shall gird thee, nor shalt thou be surpassed by unstable Delos; sacred alike to wind and wave shalt thou be, and calm abode of Nereids among the shallows (390) of the Cyclades, where the rocks are shattered by Aegean storms, an isle that sailors swear by—only admit no Danaan keels, I beg! 'Here are only the wands of Bacchus, nought that avails for war;' that tale bid rumour spread, and while the Dorian armaments make ready (395) and Mavors rages from world to world—he may, for aught I care—let Achilles be the maiden daughter of good Lycomedes."

A Caring Mother's Speech

Thetis has taken her son from his tutor Chiron and brought him to Scyros. Wishing to save him from the Trojan War, she vainly tries to persuade him to put on women's clothes. In her speech (252-274), Thetis first of all emphasizes the danger to Achilles' life and her own concern for him by contrasting the present situation with the security he and she would have enjoyed if she had been allowed to become the mother of an immortal son of Jupiter (252-255). Thus, Statius appropriately begins with a portrait of Thetis' character, which depicts both her motherly love and her wounded pride. To start with the speaker's character (*ethos*) is in accord with the teachings of rhetoric. From the addressee's standpoint, Thetis' motherly concern would have been a good enough introduction; the allusion to the misalliance, however, which implicitly degrades Achilles' father, must have hurt the boy's pride: it is a product of the mother's egotistic thought and detrimental to her aim of persuasion. She goes on to say that Achilles, being the son of a mortal, and in imminent danger, has to make concessions and put on the clothes she gives him (256-260). With the best of intentions, Thetis heaps up examples of heroes and gods in women's clothes: Hercules serving Omphale, Bacchus wearing a long dress, Jupiter disguised as Diana, and Caenis changed into a man. Apart from the fact that most of these examples are not to the point and that the one suitable parallel, Hercules, is strikingly ridiculous, their very explicitness and suggestiveness must, instead of persuading the boy, produce a horrifying effect on him. More convincing is the argument that the disguise is only temporary and that Achilles will soon be allowed to return to Chiron (265-267). The

peroration dwells pathetically on his beauty and youth which he should be allowed to enjoy (to me this sounds like the argument of an adult, not a youth); she goes on to mention her humiliation at becoming a mortal's wife "for her son's sake" (an argument not quite logical, but quite human, though a strange and even shocking thing to say to her son). Finally, she mentions her not entirely successful attempt to make Achilles invulnerable by bathing him in the Styx. All of this is said to entice him to put on these clothes which promise safety "and will not harm his manly spirit". Here the boy's revulsion bursts out into gestures, which the poet, avoiding stage directions, immediately conveys through Thetis' speech: "Why do you start back? What does that look mean? Are you ashamed of being softened by this attire?" Finally, she swears by Achilles and by her element, the sea, that she will not tell Chiron anything about the disguise. This charming touch shows that, at last, she has understood some of her son's feelings, though the mention of the teacher at the very end of the speech will prove ill-advised. In fact, this name will stick in the boy's mind, and together with the thought of his father, an idol unshaken by the mother's irreverent speech, will strengthen the son's own nature to rebel against her plan (275-277).

The speech, meant to persuade the boy, in fact one-sidedly reflects the mother's perspective. The reader witnesses, at every stage, the failure of Thetis' speech, which gradually, by its very explications, lets him divine the boy's negative reaction long before the gestures of resistance are verbalized. More and more, the reader comes to feel the boy's aversion to his mother's requests; at the same time, he more and more pities the loving mother, so unsuccessful in her attempts to protect her child from his own nature.

Epic Traditions Exploited in an Erotic Context

Finally, the essence of the boy's recalcitrance is captured in the image of an unsuccessful attempt to tame a young horse used to freedom and quite unprepared for, and even shocked at, the idea of learning a new gait (278-282). From this simile we see that Statius knows his epic tradition (the *campi* and *fluuii* as well as *gauisus* are epic pointers),[1] but consciously deviates from it. Rather, the basic idea is reminiscent of a simile in Horace's *Satires* which shows the futility of trying to train

---

[1] See our chapter: A Horse Simile in Ennius.

an ass (Horace, *Sat.* 1. 1. 90-91). In accordance with the exigencies of post-Virgilian epic, Statius replaced the ass with a nobler animal. Especially to the point is the horse's astonishment at having to learn a new gait which foreshadows the lesson of lady-like behaviour that Thetis will give her son later on.

The change in Achilles' mind is prepared by the traditional question *quis deus?*, which in the *Iliad* (1. 8) introduces the motivation of the hero's anger and in the *Aeneid* (9. 77) announces the metamorphosis of the ships brought about by the *Magna Mater*; both reminiscences are to the point since there will be strong emotion in Achilles as well as a change.[1] Homer and Virgil had immediately answered the question by naming the god. In our context, the obvious answer would be Venus or Cupid, but Statius first mentions Pallas, thus savouring the irony of the fact that the feast of a virgin goddess gives Achilles occasion to fall in love.

The poet describes the entire group of Lycomedes' daughters as young maidens in the bloom of their youth. By combining the word *uirginitas* with the idea of sensuous appeal,[2] Statius gives to the scene the freshness of a first experience, all the more appropriate because it is viewed through the eyes of a young Achilles. The preeminence of Deidamia among her sisters is shown in the traditional Diana simile, which had been applied by Homer to Nausicaa (*Od.* 6. 102-109), and by Virgil to Dido (*Aen.* 1. 498-504). Yet Statius adds an erotic touch by introducing Venus into this context; imagining this goddess among the nymphs of the sea, he seems to think of a picture representing the birth of Venus.

The poet goes on to describe Deidamia's beauty (297-298): "Purple is burning on her rosy face, a light greater than that of jewels is in her eyes and gold of a more alluring gleam" *illius et roseo flammatur purpura uultu / et gemmis lux maior inest et blandius aurum.* These verses so meaningfully echo the introduction of Achilles (161-162) that they cannot even be understood without that background: "Purple fire spreads over his snow-white face, his hair is shining brightly, more graceful than yellow gold, and in his eyes calm torches glow" *niueo natat ignis in ore / pupureus fuluoque nitet coma gratior auro .../ tranquillaeque faces oculis.* This parallel requires us to refer *lux* to Deidamia's eyes and *aurum* to her hair (*gemmis* is an ablative of comparison). The

1 *Quae mens detraxit?* (*Ach.* 1. 284) is reminiscent of *quae te ... sententia uertit?* (*Aen.* 1. 237).

2 So, Claudian, *De Raptu Proserpinae* 1. 130-132.

implicit idea of a precious stone set in gold is corroborated by Virgil's Ascanius simile (*Aen.* 10. 134-138).

As Achilles had been compared to Apollo (165-166), now Deidamia is compared to Diana. Both similes are to be taken together (as is the case with Virgil's corresponding similes applied to Aeneas and Dido (*Aen.* 1. 497-504; 692-693; 4. 143-150), the *Aeneid* being an important subtext to the *Achilleid*).[1] Statius, however, adds Venus to make clear what godhead broke the ice. There is an interesting coexistence of Venus and Diana in Deidamia; the charm of the one adds to the charm of the other, and Statius intentionally enhances the contrast by finally comparing Deidamia to Minerva, who is the very embodiment of virginity. He is cautious enough, though, to add that the parellel would work if Minerva took off her breastplate and helmet, an assumption inspired by Ovid, *Met.* 1. 695-697. Moreover, Statius arranges the three goddesses to whom he compares Deidamia in a meaningful gradation rising from Venus to Diana and Minerva.

From 285 up to this point, the narrator had used only background tenses (285 *celebrabat*; 288 *exierant*) and the present, which is especially appropriate to descriptions and similes. Now, for the first time, the historical perfect is used to show the deep impression the sight of Deidamia made on Achilles (303, *deriguit* prepared by *hanc ubi ... uidit*). The next sentence, which depicts the visible symptoms of love (304-306),[2] is appositely in the present tense. To describe the change of colour in Achilles' cheeks Statius uses two similes (milk mixed with blood, or ivory coloured with purple 307-310)[3] in which the expressive verbs *fuscant* and *corrumpitur* stress the dynamic element; the poet thus captures the movement, the very process of mixture and change.

With the subjunctive, we enter a new sphere of language and thought: Statius traces the hidden impulses of Achilles' heart; his drive to disturb the rites and to rape the maiden is only bridled by shame and respect for his mother. Thus, the poet observes the coexistence of "adult" and childish elements in Achilles, all of which is reflected in a bull simile: is not our hero like a young bull whose premature admiration for heifers is noticed and checked by the cowherds?

---

[1] There is a monologue of Thetis (*Ach.* 1. 31-51) reminiscent of Juno's monologue (*Aen.* 1. 37-49); later Venus entreated Neptune (*Ach.* 1. 61-76) as Venus had entreated Jupiter (*Aen.* 1. 229-253).

[2] Cf. the commentaries on Catullus, *Carm.* 51.

[3] Cf. Homer, *Iliad* 4. 141-145; Virg., *Aen.* 12. 67-69.

This entire section, with astounding visual suggestivity, reveals what is going on in Achilles' heart. It is a psychological tableau translated into the dynamic language of poetry. Throughout there are polarities: Venus and Minerva, red and white, the young man's impetuousness and the boy's respect for his mother. Thus the psychological analysis becomes neither static nor boring.

"Elegiac" Elements and a "Metamorphosis"

At this moment, Thetis takes her chance (note the expressive initial position of *occupat*). This time her speech is short and to the point: is it really so loathsome a thing to dance among these girls and join arms with them? Is there anything like this to be found at the foot of the icy Ossa or on the ridges of Pelion? (*Quid tale* strikes a colloquial chord). In her excitement Thetis already sees herself as a grandmother. This short speech, though for reasons other than the art of rhetoric, proves much more effective than the preceding long oration. Gradually, Achilles' resistance melts, a change attended by visible reactions, blushing for joy, casting sideward glances, and pushing away the robes with less conviction. Again, the stress is on ambiguity (325 *ambiguum*). The oxymoron *cogique uolentem* sums up the idea; humorously, Statius talks of Achilles as if he were a girl; recall Corinna's feigned resistance in a love scene (Ovid, *Am.* 1. 5. 15-16) and, especially, *Ars* 1. 699 where Ovid had said the same thing of Deidamia conquered by Achilles: "She was conquered by force (so we are supposed to believe); actually, however, she wished to be conquered by force" *uiribus illa quidem uicta est (ita credere oportet) / sed uoluit uinci uiribus illa tamen.* With this allusion Statius emphasizes the "change of sex" which Achilles endures.

The following lines describe a metamorphosis: having thrown the garment over him, Thetis gradually changes the posture of his neck, his shoulders, his arms, then combs his hair, gives him her own necklace, shows him how to walk in a long embroidered dress and teaches him good speech and deportment. A simile makes it clear that Statius is playing with the idea of metamorphosis: the goddess changes her son as an artist shapes wax. The simile had been used by Ovid to illustrate the migration of souls which keep their identity, but take ever new shapes (*Met.* 15. 169-172). At the end of the passage, Statius comes back to his favorite idea of ambiguity. The metamorphosis did not require much work on the part of Thetis, since Achilles still had,

despite his manhood, the charm of a child. This ambiguity is now reinterpreted in terms of ambiguity of gender (336-337).

Finally, there is a step forward in the action (*procedunt* 338). The time which it takes to approach the king is fittingly filled with some additional motherly advice; the repeated use of *sic* evokes the gestures with which Thetis demonstrates to her son how to move. Now it is Achilles to whom the Diana simile is transferred, and Thetis, like Latona, arranges her daughter's attire. The play with Virgilian reminiscences serves to emphasize the same ambiguity which is developed by Statius in different aspects and variations.

An Ambiguous Speech

The speech, with which the mother "straightaway" (*protinus*) addresses the king (349), is anything but straightforward; it is ambiguous throughout, though spoken in presence of the altars (349). First she introduces her child as the sister of her Achilles (350), and, coquettishly, almost lifts the mask by pointing out the girl's austerity, her close resemblance to her brother, her wish to bear arms and to live like an unmarried Amazon. Since she has enough concerns with her son, Thetis asks the king to guard this child and have it behave as befits a young lady, especially avoiding such immodest pursuits as gymnastics or running through the woods, to keep her inside the palace together with the other girls, and not let her come near the shore, lest she should be raped like Helen.

In this speech, the main interest is not the deception of the king (which was easily done since Thetis was a goddess as the author duly stresses in 366), but the reader's delight in knowing more than the king does and being able to understand the artful ambiguities of Thetis' words. Instead of mere persuasion, the aim of such a speech is the reader's enjoyment as he recognizes the discrepancy between the words and the facts and, what is more, the pleasure to discover time and again unexpected convergencies between both, which give to Thetis' lies some delightful touches of risky truthfulness. And the play on ignorance goes on: the good king even thanks Thetis for having chosen him.

Achilles Accepted Among the Daughters of Lycomedes

Then Achilles, in his new guise, is seen through the eyes of the young daughters of Lycomedes. First they give their new companion some

long and inquisitive looks, evaluating "her" stature and figure. Then they ask her to participate in their dances and chaste rites, make room for her, and, finally, are happy to touch her. Thus the poet, step by step, shows a progression from distant looks to physical closeness. The same process is reflected in a bird simile about the gradual acceptance of a new member into a flock of doves. To avoid mere repetition, the action in the simile leads further: the doves escort their new companion to their loft. The wording is important; *cubilia* means literally "bed", and the doves are called "birds of Venus" (*Idaliae uolucres* 372). Thus, the simile anticipates the erotic implications of the situation, which are not yet evident to the maidens.

After long hesitations and final admonitions, Thetis leaves, not without addressing the land to which she committed her son, wishing it lasting honour, and asking it to keep her secret, and not admit Greek ships. The final words of the speech once more stress the "metamorphosis": "Let Achilles be the maiden daughter of good Lycomedes" *sit uirgo pii Lycomedis Achilles* (396).

Not only in his speeches, but throughout his narrative, Statius plays on polarities: first there is the contrast between the young man and the boy Achilles; then this antithesis is reconciled by Achilles' falling in love and therefore accepting his mother's strategy. This gives birth to a new polarity, the contrast between Achilles the young man and Achilles the girl.

Epilogue: Much is to be said of the impact of rhetorical devices on Statius' poetic invention. He lays considerable stress on the visible expression of feelings by gestures; this is true for the similes as well as the speeches and the narrative itself. By his art the poet produces a kind of second reality which perfectly reflects psychological processes and endows them with visual suggestiveness. This creation of Statius' might be subsumed under the rhetorical term of *euidentia* (*enargeia*), the art of putting ideas and emotions before the readers' eye as if they were tangible things and living reality.

As for the speeches, Thetis' first address is meant to convince Achilles but fails to do so. The more the speech progresses, the more the reader comes to feel the uneasiness of the addressee, which finally erupts into gestures of revulsion. The ambiguity of this oration, therefore, can only be perceived when we listen to it with the addressee's ear. On the other hand, Thetis' instructions to Lycomedes can only be fully enjoyed when the reader takes the speaker's point of view.

While in the first speech persuasion is intended, not obtained, in the second speech it is so easily obtained that the speech seems almost unnecessary. As far as real persuasion is concerned, both orations reveal the futility of rhetoric in this context. Instead, the poet lends the speeches secondary functions, which are intimately related to his "dialectic" approach to life; thus, in the first address to Achilles there is a clash between persuasion as a goal and non-persuasion as an effect. As for the impact on the reader, we observe an intriguing mixture of increasing understanding of the boy's reluctance and increasing sympathy with the mother's concern. In the directions she gives to Lycomedes there is a polarity between the negligible expediency of the speech and the considerable pleasure produced by the ambiguity of its wording.

It follows that Statius' poetic invention is strengthened by the rhetorical principle of *enargeia* whereas, on the other hand, his treatment of speeches is liable to reveal the futility of rhetoric. Both imagery and speeches are adapted to his overall poetic aims, vivid visualization of psychological processes, mostly within the framework of two antagonistic principles, and a polarity which helps to unfold emotions and actions in a dramatic way.

Furthermore, there is a subtle play on intertextual relationships within the epic tradition. This is especially striking in Statius' frequent use of epic similes. Here the poet largely draws on epic tradition without, however, being enslaved by it, and he adds new and lively touches. Interestingly enough, he observes the relationship of structure and meaning between Virgilian similes, first adopting Virgil's pattern by comparing the lover to Apollo and the beloved to Diana and, then, on the occasion of the disguise, in playfully transferring the Diana simile to the boy. The similes are not merely accumulated, but artfully arranged to form a gradation. There is a system behind the sequence of goddesses, and there is a dramatic development within each simile and from one simile to the next.

The clash of genres, elegy versus epic, is an important source of "intertextual" play on the readers' expectations (in the broader sense of the term). On a more abstract level, Statius largely exploits interferences of different cultural systems. In Achilles, for example, there is a conflict between the specific codes of different genders and ages: is he a girl or a boy, a child or a young man? These crossings are a constant source of intellectual delight for both the author and his reader.

CHAPTER TWELVE

SILIUS ITALICUS

1. Intertextuality as Guiding Principle of Invention

This chapter was written because most of our literary histories make short shrift of Silius Italicus.[1]

A "Stoic" Between Cicero's Property and the Tomb of Virgil

Tiberius Catius Asconius Silius Italicus[2] hailed from noble family, perhaps from Patavium in Venetia, the native town of Livy, Q.Asconius (!) Pedianus, and the Stoic P.Clodius Thrasea Paetus.[3] Born between 23 and 35 A.D., he was consul under Nero in 68 and is said to have lent himself to the role of accusing others.[4] Later he was close to Vitellius[5] and was a proconsul in Asia,[6] probably in 77. He

---

[1] The present chapter is a changed and considerably augmented version of my article: "Silius Italicus. Ein vergessenes Kapitel Literaturgeschichte", in: *Argentea Aetas.* In memoriam E.V.Marmorale (Genova 1973): 181- 188; I owe many suggestions to my former student, Dr. Uwe Fröhlich, who carefully read the present chapter. For further information, see his forthcoming book: U.Fröhlich, *Regulus: Archetyp römischer Fides. Das sechste Buch als Schlüssel zu den Punica des Silius Italicus. Interpretation, Kommentar und Übersetzung,* diss. Heidelberg, 1997 (Tübingen, 1998). Text: J.Delz (Stuttgart, 1987); Concordance: M.Wacht, 2 vols. (Hildesheim, 1989); Commentary: F.Spaltenstein, 2 vols. (Genève, 1986-1990). Commentary on Book 6: Fröhlich (see above); on Book 14: P.P.K.Roosjen (Nijmegen, Maastricht, 1996, with bibl.); a just appraisal of Silius has been considerably furthered by F.Ahl, M.A.Davis, A.Pomeroy, "Silius Italicus", in: *ANRW* 2, 32, 4 (1986): 2493-2561; A.J.Pomeroy, "Silius Italicus as *doctus poeta*", in: A.J.Boyle (ed.), *The Imperial Muse. Ramus Essays on Roman Literature of the Empire. Flavian Epicist to Claudian* (Berwick, Victoria, 1990): 119-139.

[2] The full name is to be found on an inscription discovered at Aphrodisias in 1934: W.M.Calder I, "Silius Italicus in Asia", *CR* 49 (1935): 216-217; *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua.* Vol. 8: *Monuments from Lycaonia, the Pisido-Phrygian Borderland, Aphrodisias,* ed. by W.M.Calder and J.M.R.Cormack (Manchester, 1962): 76, no. 411.

[3] D.J.Campbell, "The Birthplace of Silius Italicus", *CR* 50 (1936): 56-58; R.Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958): 88 n. 7; D.W.T.Vessey, "The Origin of Ti. Catius Asconius Silius Italicus", *CB* 60 (1984): 9-10, argues in favour of Capua (cf. 11. 122-126: Silius' consulship in 68 and his son's in 94).

[4] Our main source on his life is Pliny, *Epist.* 3. 7; cf. also Dessau 6125; 9059.

[5] Cf. also Tacitus, *Hist.* 3. 65.

[6] Cf. above n. 2; as for coins, A.Klotz, *RE* 3A1 (1927): 80.

then abandoned politics and oratory to turn to poetry. He spent the evening of his life in his Campanian villas, where he enjoyed acquiring, adorning, and abandoning one villa after another. He testified to his literary predilections by purchasing some property formerly owned by Cicero and the tomb[1] of Virgil, whom he held in almost religous reverence. He delighted in literary and philosophical table-talk among friends: the Stoic Cornutus dedicated to him a book on Virgil,[2] and Epictetus attests to the high esteem Silius enjoyed among his countrymen as a philosopher.[3] Despite his delicate health he reached an old age. When he fell incurably ill, he finished his life as a true Stoic by fasting (ca. A.D. 101).[4]

It is certain that Silius wrote the *Punica* in his old age; for the details of chronology we must rely on conjecture.[5] In all probability, Silius did not compose his books in the same order as we read them but followed the method ascribed to Virgil by his biographers (*particulatim componere*). In fact, some lines in Books 3 and 9 were written no earlier than the *bellum Sarmaticum* in 92 (3. 616-617) and Domitian's death in 96 (9. 476-478).

Thus, even the facts of Silius' life reveal, first, his devotion to Virgil, an attitude, which under the aspect of intertextuality in the narrower sense of the word, will be a leading aspect of the present chapter. A second aspect attested in Silius' biography is his admiration for Cicero, whose impact on Silius both as a Republican and as an orator we will follow up in the domains of both rhetoric and political thought, with special regard to interferences of literary genres and republican and imperial political concepts (intertextuality in the broader sense of the word).

---

1 Martial, 11. 48; cf. 11. 50 (ed. D.R.Shackleton Bailey, Stuttgart 1990).

2 Charisius, *G.L.* 1. 125. 16 Keil = p. 159. 27 Barwick; G.W.Most, "Cornutus and Stoic Allegoresis: A Preliminary Report", *ANRW* 2. 36. 3 (1989): 2014-2065, esp. 2057-2059, suggests that Cornutus' *Epidrome* may serve as a key to the divine apparatus of the *Punica.*

3 Epict., *Diss.* 3. 8. 7; F.Bücheler, "Coniectanea de Silio Italico ...", *RhM* 35 (1880): 391.

4 One of his two sons died before him; the other attained the consulship (Pliny *ibid.*).

5 E.Wistrand, *Die Chronologie der Punica des Silius Italicus,* (Göteborg, 1956 = *Göteborgs Universitets Årsskrift* 62. 9); G.Laudizi, *Silio Italico. Il passato tra mito e restaurazione etica* (Galatina, 1989 = Univ. di Lecce. Dip. di scienze dell'antichità. Settore filologico-letterario. Studi di Filologia e Letteratura. Suppl. 1): 27-54 follows in Wistrand's footsteps; outdated, and even more problematic is E.Bickel, "De Silii *Punicorum* libris VII ss. post Domitianum abolitum editis", *RhM* 66 (1911): 500-512.

Sources and Models: Silius' "Intertextual" Approach[1]

Among Silius' historical sources, Livy takes pride of place, although our poet certainly consulted other historians, too. A good overview of the problem, based partly on A.Klotz's investigations, was given by J.Nicol.[2] Although Silius draws on Livy not only for content but also for the author's comments, the *Punica* is, nevertheless, an epic poem, not a simple versification of Livy.[3] Typical of the epic poet is a less sceptical attitude towards religion; consider the positive judgement Silius passes on Scipio's devotion to Jupiter in comparison with Livy who believes it to be little more than a cunning political tactic.

What is more important, Silius explicitly pays homage to his epic predecessors Virgil (8. 593-594), Ennius (12. 387-419), and Homer (13. 778-797). He incorporates Homeric scenes omitted by Virgil: the hero's farewell to his wife (Hannibal in 3. 61-157; Hector in *Iliad* 6. 392-496;[4] cf. also Lucan 5. 722-815), the river-battle (4. 570-703; *Iliad*, Book 21), and the battle of the gods (9. 278-10. 325; cf. *Iliad*, Books 20 and 5).[5] The parallel between Scipio and Achilles[6] seems to have some structural relevance, all the more considering that the games are placed in the penultimate books both of the *Iliad* and the *Punica*.[7] More frequently, however, Silius sees the *Iliad* through the prism of the *Aeneid*: consider the combination of Homeric and Virgilian motifs in Book 13. Silius also interspersed his epic with some delicate Hellenistic cameos, the colour of which, though reminiscent of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, reflects Alexandrian models. There is an unobtrusive poetic charm to passages such as the Falernus episode (7.

---

1 For a comparison of Silius and his sources, see my *Silius Italicus* (Amsterdam, 1964): 15-89.

2 *The Historical and Geographical Sources Used by Silius Italicus* (Oxford, 1936); now, also see H.G.Nesselrath, "Zu den Quellen des Silius Italicus", *Hermes* 112 (1986): 203-230.

3 In his *Poetics* (1451b) Aristotle stated that Herodotus' history, even if versified, would remain a work of history, and not become a piece of poetry.

4 Cf. my *Silius Italicus. Freiheit und Gebundenheit römischer Epik* (Amsterdam, 1964): 146 and, more fully, H.Juhnke, *Homerisches in römischer Epik flavischer Zeit. Untersuchungen zu Szenennachbildungen und Strukturentsprechungen in Statius' Thebais und Achilleis und in Silius' Punica*, (Munich, 1972 = *Zetemata* 53): 193-196 and 221. Juhnke has well shown that the scene helps to portray the enemy and that Silius (3. 163-216; 222-405) took over the "dream" and the catalogue from *Iliad*, Book 2.

5 From *Aeneid* 10. 11-15 it appears that there had been a battle of the gods in Ennius, most probably at Cannae.

6 My *Silius Italicus*: 148-149 and Juhnke: 201.

7 G.Lorenz, *Vergleichende Interpretationen zu Silius Italicus und Statius* (diss. Kiel, 1968): 231.

162-211), a genre which seems to have been more congenial to Silius' muse than grand epic.

As for Ennius, who had treated the same subject matter, we are in a difficult position. Since we know Ennius only from quotations found in other authors (such as Cicero or the commentators on Virgil), we can never be sure if Silius quotes him directly or from indirect tradition as reflected in our sources.

The *Aeneid* strongly influenced the overall structure of the *Punica*: consider the proem and Juno's speech in Book 1 and the concluding dialogue of Juno and Jupiter in the last book (Silius 17. 341-384; *Aen.* 12. 791-842). The sea storm (*Aen.* 1. 50-156) is transposed from the first to the last book (17. 218-290), and Venus' complaint together with Jupiter's prophecy (*Aen.* 1. 223-296) is aptly transferred to the moment when Hannibal has reached the summit of the Alps and Rome is seriously threatened (3. 557-629). The fall of Troy (Book 2 of the *Aeneid*) is echoed by the destruction of Saguntum (*Punica*, Book 2), and Silius even goes so far as to start Book 3 with *postquam* as Virgil has done and perhaps Ennius too. Moreover, the Roman heroes in different situations often recall Aeneas; Hannibal is reminiscent of Turnus. The *Punica* is not a mythological but an historical epic. The scenes, similes, and allusions, however, which enhance the facts are reminiscent of the *Aeneid*. The *Punica* is an historical continuation of the *Aeneid* just as the *Acts of the Apostles* are an historical sequel to the *Gospel*. Under such conditions, imitation, instead of being mere literary technique, becomes an obligation.

Perhaps it was the example of Livy and Ovid (who divided his *Metamorphoses* into *ter quinque uolumina*, *Trist.* 1. 1. 117) which encouraged Silius to create three corresponding pentads: Books 1-5, Books 7-11 and Books 13-17. The first of them decribes how Hannibal went to war against Rome, crossed the Alps and gained a series of victories without being confronted with any serious resistance. The second pentad (Books 7-11) exalts Fabius, who is the first to frighten Hannibal (7. 20-26; 146-156; 305-307), and Roman *uirtus* (*patientia*). While Roman *uirtus* weathers even the defeat of Cannae (Silius' memorable comment is: *Tempore, Roma,/ nullo maior eris* 9.351-352), the Carthaginians' *uirtus* succumbs to the charms of a Capuan winter (Book 11). The hero of Books 13-17 is Scipio. He takes the offensive, drives the Carthaginians out of Spain, transfers the theatre of war from Italy to Africa and wins the battle of Zama. Books 6 and 12, which do not belong to the adjoining pentads, culminate in interventions of Jupiter

for the benefit of the Roman capital. It testifies to Silius' originality that he did not copy mechanically the pentadic structures found in Ovid or Livy, but separated his pentads by inserting single books between them.[1]

Doubly important to Silius is Lucan, both as a Stoic poet who gave the historical facts a moral interpretation and as an author of rich geographical excursuses in the Hellenistic vein. The latter aspect helped Silius to give his epic the "universal" scope he admired in Homer (13. 788).

Inuentio: *Scenic Reminiscences and Inversions (Intertextual References Within the Work)*

Silius arranges his scenes in a chain of "isolated pictures"[2], a technique which seems to announce late antiquity. Yet, on closer examination, we discover thematic links between them.

Unlike the *Aeneid*, which has a unity of action and person, the *Punica* describes historical events in detail. This being the case, lists of past and future defeats gain structural importance, and at crucial moments, they stress the fatal sequence of events which, in huge waves, are moving against Rome.[3] Within the series of these lists there is a sensible change in the last part of the work. *Voluptas*, in her speech, tries to frighten Scipio by reminding him of Cannae and of other defeats, but achieves the contrary effect (15. 34-35). By the end of Book 15, Nero's victory at the Metaurus is said to make up for Cannae, Trebia, and Trasimene (15. 814-816). In the last book, Hannibal dreams that the Romans he killed in former battles chase him from Italy (17. 160-169), a poetic hint at the reversal of the situation. In his address to his soldiers, Hannibal once more evokes his former victories (17. 295-331); Scipio finally overthrows the conquerors of all the former battles (17. 494-502), and thus brings an end to the process of Roman retribution.[4]

---

[1] This structural analysis (a discovery of U.Fröhlich) is superior to all previous attempts; they are discussed in his forthcoming book (see above, n. 1, p. 291).

[2] Cf. F.Mehmel, *Virgil und Apollonius Rhodius* (Hamburg, 1940 = *Hamburger Arbeiten* 1).

[3] Lists of Hannibal's victories: 1. 42-54; 125-133; (cf. 546-547); 4. 59-66; 5. 154-162; 6. 106-113; 296-298; 700-713; 7. 147-150; 378; 8. 38; 665-676; 9. 185-191; 11. 134-146; 212; 12. 79-82; 547-550; 695-698; 13. 716-718; 17. 295-331 (cf. 608-610).

[4] There is some truth to Hannibal's dream since Scipio acquired his power for victory from the dead (cf. 13. 381-895; 15. 180-213); in 16. 584-591 the spear thrown to honour the dead bursts into a leaf.

The beginning and ending of the *Punica* are interrelated by scenic reminiscences and inversion of motifs. Single books are framed by parallel or conflicting elements: the first simile in Book 1 stresses Hannibal's *perfidia* (1. 324-326),[1] the last simile in the same book reflects Fabius' circumspection (1. 687-689). Book 9, which is devoted to the battle of Cannae, begins and ends with pairs of speeches portraying the contrasting characters of the two Roman generals.

Frequently moral issues are illustrated by means of structure. The same is true of stories within the story: after the defeat of Trasimene, Serranus consoles himself with the exploits of his father Regulus (6. 118-551).[2] After the battle of Cannae, the Cloelia story (10. 449-502) sets before Hannibal's eyes the unbending spirit of the Romans. We have shown elsewhere[3] that the story of Claudia Quinta, which justifies innocence and promises the end of trials, is an appropriate introduction to the last book.

Elocutio I: *The Serenity of Old Age*

Language and style are serene and clear, sometimes bordering on tautology. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Silius does not strive for brilliant displays at every opportunity, an attitude which, at that time, required some courage. At his best, Silius captures his readers not by brilliance but by simplicity. His metre is richer in spondees, and as a result, commands more *grauitas* than other examples of post-Ovidian epic.

Elocutio II: *Similes*

His similes, unlike Statius' which are dynamic images, breathe an air of rest and tranquillity (e.g. 14. 189 -191): Marcellus is like a swan who seems to stand still on a river, although under the surface he swims hard against the flow. Mental processes are reflected in other similes:

---

[1] The venomous arrow hints at Hannibal's *perfidia*; the allusion to the *dea dira* (*Aen.* 12. 856-866) is in harmony with his role of *ultor* (*Aen.* 4. 625; Silius 2. 423).

[2] E.L.Bassett, "Regulus and the Serpent in the *Punica*", *CPh* 50 (1955): 1-20 (on *Pun.* 6. 118-293); see now U.Fröhlich, *Regulus: Archetyp römischer Fides. Das 6. Buch als Schlüssel zu den Punica des Silius Italicus. Interpretation, Kommentar und Übersetzung*, forthcoming (Tübingen, 1998).

[3] "Claudia Quinta bei Silius Italicus und bei Ovid", *AU* 11, 1 (1968): 76-95; see below ch. XII.2.

the river Mæander (7. 139-140)[1] and the light reflected in the water (7. 143-145)[2] illustrate Hannibal's sophisticated stratagems.

Ethos I: *Speeches*

Speeches are an integral part of character portrayal in Silius. Scipio gives proof of his *pietas* by an elaborate and solemn oath: never will he leave the *Lavinia regna* nor allow others to leave them. Hannibal's speeches, on the other hand, are anything but patriotic; his thoughts are not centred on Carthage, but on Italy and Rome, thus betraying his *improba uirtus*, his destructive attitude.[3]

Ethos II: *Typology, Allegory, Moral and Political Ideas*

The subject of the *Punica* is the trial and vindication of Roman *uirtus* through *labores*. It is no wonder, then, that so many Roman heroes are depicted in terms consistent with Stoic views on Hercules.[4] Even the story of Hercules at the Crossroads, an allegory invented by the sophist Prodicus, is applied by the poet with reference to Scipio (15. 1-130). Different aspects of Roman *uirtus* are embodied in Paullus, Fabius, Marcellus, and Scipio,[5] whereas Hannibal, as the "great opponent", approaches Virgil's Turnus and Lucan's Caesar. The polarity of Roman *fides* and *pietas* versus Punic *ira* and *furor* is reflected in the antagonism between Jupiter and Juno. Allegorical figures (*Fides, Virtus, Voluptas*) seem to foreshadow literary techniques typical of late antiquity.[6]

The conflict—or, to be more precise, the focus of the poet's attention—moves from the field of battle to the Roman camp (witness the

---

1 Ovid, *Met.* 8. 162-168.

2 Cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 8. 18-25; N.J.H.Sturt, "The Simile of *Punica* 14. 189-191", *CJ* 74 (1978): 19-21; on Virgil's similes see my *Silius Italicus. Freiheit und Gebundenheit römischer Epik* (Amsterdam, 1964): 90-118.

3 M.Helzle, "Die Redeweise der Hauptpersonen in Silius Italicus' *Punica*", *C&M* 46 (1995): 189-213.

4 This is true even of Hannibal, cf. E.L.Bassett, "Hercules and the Hero of the *Punica*", in: L.Wallach, ed., *The Classical Tradition. Literary and Historical Studies in Honour of Harry Caplan* (Ithaca, 1966): 258-273.

5 The special importance of Scipio is stressed by Bassett (quoted above, n. 4).

6 Even D.C.Feeney (*The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* [Oxford, 1991]: 301-312), who has no great liking for Silius' divine apparatus (nor for his humans), concedes "that the most successful of Silius' divine characters are allegorical figures, who may appear for the moment of need only, then vanish" (308).

discussions between Fabius and Minucius, Paullus and Varro) and finally to the heart of Scipio (Book 15), who realizes that his people's fate is inextricably linked to his own (13. 504) and rejects Pleasure in favour of Virtue. This victory "within himself" enables him to conquer the external enemy.

Interferences of Moral Codes

Given the importance of the ideological background, it would be a vain effort to separate it from the structure of the work. Single scenes are not completely isolated[1] but related to the general idea of the *Punica.* Silius' Republican ideas are reflected all over the work; examples are the description of the contest between brothers[2] at the funeral games (16. 527-548) and the parade of the heroes of the Civil Wars (13. 850-867). As for his attitude to monarchy, new insights are to be expected from a forthcoming book by Raymond Marks. An intriguing problem is the mixture of "republican" and contemporary (monarchic) elements in Silius' epic (a phenomenon of "intertextuality" in the broader sense of the word).

Forgotten by Monks, Rejected by Classicists, but Accepted by Raphael

During the Middle Ages, Silius was virtually unknown; there is very scarce evidence of his influence.[3] Petrarch wrote his Latin epic *Africa* without knowing Silius. During the Council of Constance (in 1416 or 1417), the Florentine humanist Poggio discovered a manuscript of the *Punica,* probably in Saint Gall. Of this manuscript, in all probability, were made two copies[4] from which all later manuscripts derive.[5] After Poggio's discovery, Silius was read and imitated rather

---

[1] For a different view, Juhnke: 253 and 267.

[2] G.Lorenz: 170-208.

[3] R.Schieffer, "Silius Italicus in St. Gallen. Ein Hinweis zur Lokalisierung des Waltharius", *MLatJb* 10 (1975): 7-19.

[4] P.McGushin, *The Transmission of the Punica of Silius Italicus* (Amsterdam, 1985): 48; J.Delz, Praefatio to his Teubner Edition (Stuttgart, 1987): VI-VIII.

[5] The letter *C* designates a lost codex of the cathedral library at Cologne (9th Century): some readings have been preserved in notes of two late 16th Century scholars, but we are unable to decide whether these readings are the most significant and typical. Of the thirty-two extant manuscripts (the codex of the Propaganda does not date from the 13th, but, like the others, from the 15th Century) four had been thought to be the best (all of them from the 15th Century); this choice is unfounded. The lines 8. 144-223/224a were first published by Iacobus Constantius (Giacomo Costanzi il Giovane) in 1508 and by Franciscus Asulanus in his 1523

frequently, especially in England.[1] Soon, however, Julius Caesar Scaliger's harsh criticism[2] set a precedent and it became almost an observancy among classical scholars to blame Silius instead of reading him. Nevertheless, Thomas May imitated two scenes of the *Punica* (6. 140-293; 3. 420-441) in his English *Continuation of the Subject of Lucan's Historicall (sic!) Poem till the Death of Julius Caesar* (London, 1630) and his Latin *Supplementum Lucani Libri VII* (Leyden, 1640).[3] In the 19th Century, the German poet and politician Ludwig Uhland, a champion of freedom and democracy, translated the scene "Scipio at the Crossroads".[4] In the Italian Renaissance, no lesser a painter than Raphael[5] had treated the same subject in one of his famous works. At crucial epochs of the modern age, therefore, some creative artists were especially receptive to the stress laid by Silius on man's freedom of will and on the historical importance of moral decisions. Unfortunately, the practical impact of this message on modern politicians was to be as negligible as Silius' on Domitian.

Epilogue: Silius was an orator himself; moreover, rhetorical influences came to him through Livy's speeches, through Ovid's allegorical figures, and through Lucan's use of rhetoric in an historical epic. In more general terms, intertextuality is essential to the *Punica*. The *Aeneid* serves as a subtext and as a frame of reference allowing to assess the function and the importance of each of Silius' Roman heroes.[6] No other Roman epic poet made a virtue of necessity to such a degree as Silius did. He even took the risk of being labelled a *simia Vergili* ("ape of Virgil"). He regards the *Aeneid* as some kind of "sacred story" and is eager to show how each of his heroes followed in the footsteps of Aeneas. In his artistic self-denial he is often satisfied with

---

Aldina, but their authenticity is open to debate (The latest contribution to the discussion: G.Brugnoli, C.Santini, *L'Additamentum Aldinum di Silio Italico* (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Roma, 1995 = Bollettino dei Classici, Suppl. 14). We owe an excellent edition of the *Punica* to J.Delz (Stuttgart, 1987), which surpasses by far the old edition of L.Bauer, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1890-1892).

1 E.L.Bassett, "Silius Italicus in England", *CPh* 48 (1953): 155-168.

2 *Poetices Libri Septem* (Lyon, 1561): 324

3 R.T.Bruère, "The Latin and English Versions of Thomas May's *Supplementum Lucani*", *CPh* 44 (1949): 145-163.

4 Gedichte, Critical ed. by E.Schmidt and J.Hartmann 2 (Stuttgart, 1898): 212-215.

5 E.Panofsky, *Hercules am Scheidewege und andere antike Bildstoffe in der neueren Kunst* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1930 = *Studien der Bibliothek Warburg*, 18).

6 See my *Silius Italicus* (quoted above, n. 4, p. 293).

establishing a parallel between his work and the *Aeneid* and with leaving it to his reader to work out the details. To assess the *Punica* correctly we should compare his method to the use Christian authors made of the *Gospels*. The *Acts of the Apostles* show several historical characters in the footsteps of their Master; other examples are found in early Christian biographies and in many novels of the modern age.[1] Walter Berschin called this working method "background style".[2] Especially intriguing are "imitations by contrast": Hannibal's shield in depicting the hero's transgression of the Roman frontier illustrates his *perfidia*, and thus forms an antitype to the shield of Aeneas, which enhances typically Roman virtues.[3]

Silius' philosophy of history is built on freedom of will.[4] He invites his reader to an intertextual approach both within his own work and in comparison with Virgil. The scene of Scipio at the Crossroads[5] is a classical example of a hero's choice between two systems of values. The alternatives are expounded explicitly and even embodied in two allegorical figures who differ considerably in speech and appearance. By rejecting the vicious alternative, Scipio takes the first step to saving his country and winning the war. For Silius, the fates (*fata*) of the Roman people depend on those of Scipio (13. 504), which, in their turn, are conditioned by his moral decision. In Silius, the borderlines between Good and Evil are drawn very clearly; there is no ambivalence as in Ovid's Arachne story. An exception is the figure of Hannibal, in whom the negative clichés are mitigated by some human features. As a rule, however, the *Punica* adheres to a univocal social and moral pattern which has been drawn from the *Aeneid*, though lacking Virgil's wide range of shades and undertones.

---

1 D.Sölle, *Realisation. Studien zum Verhältnis von Theologie und Dichtung nach der Aufklärung* (Darmstadt, 1973).

2 W.Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart, 1986): on "Hintergrundstil" see esp. pp. 71-74 (Christian); 72-73 (political).

3 See my *Silius Italicus* (quoted above, n. 4, p. 293): 175.

4 W.Kißel, *Das Geschichtsbild des Silius Italicus* (Frankfurt, 1979): 65.

5 On this, see E.Heck, "Scipio am Scheideweg. Die *Punica* des Silius Italicus und Ciceros Schrift *De re publica*", *WS* 83, n.s. 4 (1970): 156-180 (interestingly enough, Heck discovers much more rhetoric in the speech of Voluptas than in that of Virtus: 177; cf. also 13. 663).

2. From Elegy to Epic. *Claudia Quinta: Beauty under False Suspicion*[1]

Ovid, *Fasti* 4. 291-348

Ostia contigerat, qua se Tiberinus in altum
diuidit et campo liberiore natat:
omnis eques mixtaque grauis cum plebe senatus
obuius ad Tusci fluminis ora uenit.
procedunt pariter matres nataeque nurusque
quaeque colunt sanctos uirginitate focos.
sedula fune uiri contento brachia lassant:
uix subit aduersas hospita nauis aquas.
sicca diu fuerat tellus, sitis usserat herbas:
sedit limoso pressa carina uado.
quisquis adest operi, plus quam pro parte laborat,
adiuuat et fortis uoce sonante manus.
illa uelut medio stabilis sedet insula ponto:
attoniti monstro stantque pauentque uiri.
Claudia Quinta genus Clauso referebat ab alto,
nec facies impar nobilitate fuit:
casta quidem, sed non et credita: rumor iniquus
laeserat, et falsi criminis acta rea est;
cultus et ornatis uarie prodisse capillis
obfuit, ad rigidos promptaque lingua senes.
conscia mens recti famae mendacia risit,
sed nos in uitium credula turba sumus.
haec ubi castarum processit ab agmine matrum
et manibus puram fluminis hausit aquam,
ter caput inrorat, ter tollit in aethera palmas
(quicumque aspiciunt, mente carere putant)
summissoque genu uoltus in imagine diuae
figit et hos edit crine iacente sonos:
'supplicis, alma, tuae, genetrix fecunda deorum,
accipe sub certa condicione preces.
casta negor. si tu damnas, meruisse fatebor;
morte luam poenas iudice uicta dea.
sed si crimen abest, tu nostrae pignora uitae
re dabis et castas casta sequere manus.'
dixit et exiguo funem conamine traxit
(mira, sed et scaena testificata loquar):
mota dea est sequiturque ducem laudatque sequendo:
index laetitiae fertur ad astra sonus.
fluminis ad flexum ueniunt (Tiberina priores
atria dixerunt), unde sinister abit.

---

1 Ovid: Text and Translation: J.G.Frazer (London, 1929, vol.1 of 5 vols.). Silius Italicus: Text: I.Delz (Stuttgart, 1987); Translation: J.D.Duff (Cambridge, Mass., 1934, reprint 1961).

nox aderat: querno religant in stipite funem
dantque leui somno corpora funca cibo.
lux aderat: querno soluunt a stipite funem;
ante tamen posito tura dedere foco,
ante coronarunt puppem et sine labe iuuencam
mactarunt operum coniugiique rudem.
est locus, in Tiberim qua lubricus influit Almo
et nomen magno perdit in amne minor:
illic purpurea canus cum ueste sacerdos
Almonis dominam sacraque lauit aquis.
exululant comites, furiosaque tibia flatur,
et feriunt molles taurea terga manus.
Claudia praecedit laeto celeberrima uoltu,
credita uix tandem teste pudica dea;
ipsa sedens plaustro porta est inuecta Capena:
sparguntur iunctae flore recente boues.
Nasica accepit. templi non perstitit auctor:
Augustus nunc est, ante Metellus erat.

She had arrived at Ostia, where the Tiber divides to join the sea and flows with ampler sweep. All the knights and the grave senators, mixed up with the common folk, came to meet her at the mouth of the Tuscan river. (295) With them walked mothers and daughters and brides, and the virgins who tended the sacred hearths. The men wearied their arms by tugging lustily at the rope; hardly did the foreign ship make head against the stream. A drought had long prevailed; the grass was parched and burned; (300) the loaded bark sank in the muddy shallows. Every man who lent a hand toiled beyond his strength and cheered on the workers by his cries. Yet the ship stuck fast, like an island firmly fixed in the middle of the sea. Astonished at the portent, the men did stand and quake. (305) Claudia Quinta traced her descent from Clausus of old, and her beauty matched her nobility. Chaste was she, though not reputed so. Rumour unkind had wronged her, and a false charge had been trumped up against her: it told against her that she dressed sprucely, that she walked abroad with her hair dressed in varied fashion, (310) that she had a ready tongue for gruff old men. Conscious of innocence, she laughed at fame's untruths; but we of the multitude are prone to think the worst. When she had stepped forth from the procession of the chaste matrons, and taken up the pure water of the river in her hands, (315) she thrice let it drip on her head, and thrice lifted her palms to heaven (all who looked on her thought that she was out of her mind), and bending the knee she fixed her eyes on the image of the goddess, and with dishevelled hair uttered these words: 'Thou fruitful Mother of the Gods, (320) graciously accept thy suppliant's prayers on one condition. They say I am not chaste. If thou dost condemn me, I will confess my guilt; convicted by the verdict of a goddess, I will pay the penalty with my life. But if I am free of crime, give by thine act a proof of my innocency, and, chaste as thou art, do thou yield to my chaste hands.' (325) She spoke, and drew the rope with a slight effort. My story is a strange one, but it is attested by the stage. The goddess was moved, and followed her leader, and by following bore witness in her favour: a sound of joy was wafted to the stars.

They came to a bend in the river, (330) where the stream turns away to the left: men of old named it the Halls of Tiber. Night drew on; they tied the rope to an oaken stump, and after a repast disposed themselves to slumber light. At dawn of day they loosed the rope from the oaken stump; but first they set down a brazier and put incense on it, (335) and crowned the poop, and sacrificed an unblemished heifer that had known neither the yoke nor the bull. There is a place where the smooth Almo flows into the Tiber, and the lesser river loses its name in the great one. There a hoary-headed priest in purple robe (340) washed the Mistress and her holy things in the waters of Almo. The attendants howled, the mad flute blew, and hands unmanly beat the leathern drums. Attended by a crowd, Claudia walked in front with joyful face, her chastity at last vindicated by the testimony of the goddess. (345) The goddess herself, seated in a waggon, drove in through the Capene Gate; fresh flowers were scattered on the yoked oxen. Nasica received her. The name of the founder of the temple has not survived; now it is Augustus; formerly it was Metellus.

Silius Italicus 17. 1-47

Hostis ut Ausoniis decederet aduena terris,
fatidicae fuerant oracula prisca Sibyllae,
caelicolum Phrygia genetricem sede petitam
Laomedonteae sacrandam moenibus urbis;
aduectum exciperet numen, qui, lectus ab omni
concilio patrum praesentis degeret aeui
optimus. en nomen melius maiusque triumphis!
iamque petita aderat Latia portante Cybele
puppe, atque ante omnes magno cedente senatu,
obuius accitis properabat Scipio sacris,
qui genitus patruo ductoris ad Africa bella
tunc lecti multa fulgebat imagine auorum.
isque ubi longinquo uenientia numina ponto
accepit supplex palmis Tuscique sonora
Thybridis adduxit sublimis ad ostia puppim,
femineae tum deinde manus subiere, per amnem
quae traherent celsam religatis funibus alnum.
circum arguta cauis tinnitibus aera, simulque
certabant rauco resonantia tympana pulsu
semiuirique chori, gemino qui Dindyma monte
casta colunt, qui Dictaeo bacchantur in antro,
quique Idaea iuga et lucos nouere silentes.
hos inter fremitus ac laeto uota tumultu
substitit adductis renuens procedere uinclis
sacra ratis subitisque uadis immobilis haesit.
tum puppe e media magno clamore sacerdos:
"parcite pollutis contingere uincula palmis
et procul hinc, moneo, procul hinc, quaecumque profanae,
ferte gradus nec uos casto miscete labori,

dum satis est monuisse deae. quod si qua pudica
mente ualet, si qua illaesi sibi corporis adstat
conscia, uel sola subeat pia munera dextra."
hic, prisca ducens Clausorum ab origine nomen
Claudia, non aequa populi male credita fama
in puppim uersis palmisque oculisque profatur:
"caelicolum genetrix, numen, quod numina nobis
cuncta creas, cuius proles terramque fretumque
sideraque et manes regnorum sorte gubernant,
si nostrum nullo uiolatum est crimine corpus,
testis, diua, ueni et facili me absolue carina."
tum secura capit funem, fremitusque leonum
audiri uisus subito, et grauiora per aures
nulla pulsa manu sonuerunt tympana diuae.
fertur prona ratis (uentos impellere credas)
contraque aduersas ducentem praeuenit undas.
extemplo maior cunctis spes pectora mulcet
finem armis tandem finemque uenire periclis.

In ancient times the Sibyl had foretold that, in order to dislodge an invader from Italian soil, the Romans must invite the Mother of the Gods to leave her seat in Phrygia, and must set up her worship within the walls of their city; and the goddess must be received at her landing by that citizen whom the whole body of the Senate chose out (5) as the most virtuous of men then living. That was a title more glorious and higher than any triumph. So Cybele was invited, and now she was nearing land, on board a Roman vessel, when Scipio, given precedence by all the noble senators, made haste to meet the foreign deity. His father was uncle of the Scipio (10) just chosen to conduct the war in Africa; and his lineage was long and illustrious. When he had welcomed the goddess after her long voyage with hands held up in prayer and, standing high, had brought the vessel to the loud-sounding mouth of Tuscan Tiber, (15) the hands of women were next employed, to draw the tall ship up the stream with ropes. The cymbals made a noise all round with their hollow tinklings, and the hoarse note of the drums vied with the cymbals. And her troop of unsexed votaries were there—those who haunt the twin peaks of chaste Mount Dindyma, (20) and who hold revel in the cave of Dicte, and those who know the heights of Ida and its silent sacred groves. Amid their wild cries and the prayers of the rejoicing multitude, the sacred ship refused to answer the pull of the ropes: she stopped suddenly and remained motionless on the river-bed. (25) Then a priest cried aloud from the centre of the ship: "Touch not the ropes with guilty hands! Away, away! far from hence, all ye unchaste, I warn you, and take no share in the sacred task; or the goddess may not be content with a mere warning. But if any woman is strong in her chastity, (30) if any who stands here is conscious of a body unstained, let her, even single-handed, undertake the pious duty."

Then Claudia spoke out. She derived her name from the ancient stock of the Clausi, but false report among the people had darkened her fame. Turning her eyes and open hands to the vessel, she spoke thus: (35) "O Mother of the gods, divine parent of all whom we worship, whose children

cast lots for kingdoms and rule the earth and sea, the stars and the nether world, if I am free from all stain of unchastity, come thou and bear me witness, and prove my innocence by the ease with which the vessel moves." (40) Then, full of confidence, she grasped a rope; and suddenly it seemed that the roaring of lions was heard, and Cybele's drums, though no hand beat them, sounded louder in all ears. The ship moved forward as if driven by the wind and outstripped Claudia as she drew it along against the stream. (45) At once all hearts were cheered by stronger hopes that an end of war and an end of disaster was coming at last.

Not without reason is Ovid considered to be the forerunner of the Silver Age of Latin Literature.[1] However, general terms of criticism such as "mannerism" sometimes seem to blur the issues rather than clarify them. By comparing parallel texts we can hope to grasp some aspects of the intricate interplay between epic and elegy, late Augustan Alexandrianism and late Flavian classicism, and individual choices made by poets at different stages of their lives. Our intention is not to study source problems,[2] but to get a clearer idea of Ovid's and Silius' narrative technique and style.

Ovid's "Elegiac" and Callimachean Narrative

In the 4th Book of the *Fasti* under the date of the 4th of April, Ovid discusses the celebration of the *Magna Mater.* A dialogue between the poet and the Muse, in the spirit of Callimachus, frames the story; Erato answers different questions at varying lengths; asymmetry is intended by the poet to reflect Callimachean principles. Our subject is the fifth of these questions, the cult of the *Magna Mater* transplanted to Rome. It is not only due to its length that this passage is the most important in the entire series of questions. The story is introduced as an ætiological tale, although, as the narrative develops, a different point of view will gain more prominence.

The ætiological approach prompts Ovid not to start (as Silius will do) with the goddess' arrival at the mouth of the Tiber, but to enlarge on the previous events. In agreement with the theme of the *Fasti,* Ovid begins with the goddess and her ancient love for Troy (249-

[1] For important modifications of this simplistic view, see K.Galinsky, "Was Ovid a Silver Latin Poet?", *ICS* 14 (1989): 69-88.

[2] This has been admirably done by E.Schmidt, *Kultübertragungen* (Gießen, 1909 = *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten* 8. 2): 1-30 ("Erstes Kapitel: Die Übertragung der Magna Mater nach Rom").

252); likewise, in the centre of this retrospect view there is mention of the *Magna Mater* and the wondrous manifestation of her willingness to follow the Roman delegates (267-270). This miracle is a turning point in the narrative: King Attalus gives up his reluctance and allows the goddess to be transferred to Rome. All this shows that the recapitulation of the antecedents is exclusively centred on the *Magna Mater*. A paragraph in which there is an Alexandrian accumulation of place-names in an uninterrupted chain helps the reader to visualize the voyage and, at the same time, serves as a transition to the story of Claudia Quinta (277-290).

The second part of the narrative, which we will study more closely, is slightly longer than the introduction: 58 lines (291-348) compared to 42 (249-290). The presence of a break before line 291, which has passed unnoticed by F. Bömer,[1] is strongly advocated by the use of tenses: *contigerat* (291) forms the background[2] for the following main verb *uenit* (294). This is a non-subordinate sentence connection typical of Roman poetic language; it has the same function which subordination would perform in prose. Between two sentences related to each other in this way, there is no break; hence, we are not allowed to begin a new paragraph with the second sentence. In other instances in our text Ovid starts a new paragraph with an imperfect or pluperfect, using these tenses to create a background for an action to come (299; 305; 331; 333). Observation of the use of tenses helps to structure the text. Moreover, the use of a loose construction at the beginning allows the poet to spare the use of subordinate sentences for the central part of the narrative (313); loose or tight sentence structures reflect different degrees of syntactic tension in the course of the narrative.

The setting for the first scene is created by the sentence *ostia contigerat*, which is qualified by a relative clause. With considerable visual suggestivity, Ovid depicts a colourful crowd scene, all of it in the historic present. In the crowd are knights, the people, the senate (293), and Roman ladies who are more specifically differentiated, mothers, daughters, daughters-in-law, and Vestal virgins (295-296). This stream of people moving towards the mouth of the river, meets

---

[1] G.A.Davis, in: J.P.Postgate, *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum* 1 (London, 1894) and J.G.Frazer, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex. Vol. I: Text and Translation* (London, 1929), have the paragraphs and the punctuation right.

[2] The term "background tense" is used by H.Weinrich, *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt* (Stuttgart, 1964).

(from line 297 on) with the contrary movement (which is introduced without a connection) of strong men laboriously dragging the big boat up the river.

A new paragraph starts with a pluperfect (299): for a long time the earth had been dry. It is against this background that the following crucial event is viewed: the keel sticks in the shallow mud. For the first time the perfect is used here, stressing that the accident really took place and that it was momentous. The vain attempts to make the vessel float are told in the historic present, which is more common in poetry than the perfect and, therefore, appropriate to describe details of attendant circumstance. Yet, like an island in the sea, the ship does not move, a simile which vividly captures the situation. The poet then goes on to use the present: there the men stand, awe-struck.

In the next paragraph Ovid introduces Claudia Quinta, who, for him more than for Silius Italicus, is the central figure of the story; hence, the circumstantial exposition. The background is, once more, introduced by the appropriate tenses, an imperfect [305] and a pluperfect [308], each of them supplemented by a comment in a non-narrative perfect. The change of tenses adds to the charm of Claudia's introduction. Though of high birth and flawless character, she had been wrongly suspected of immoral behaviour by gossips. Ovid adds four explanatory lines (all of them in the matter-of-fact perfect): the only evidence was her fashionable appearance and her quickness of wit in rebuffing surly moralists; but the mere fact that her conscience was clear was unable to silence suspicion. Ovid's passionate plea for that charming woman might be partly due to his own situation. Was not the elegant and witty author of the *Art of Love* accused of immorality? Ovid ends this paragraph with a maxim: "We are all ready to believe the worst." *Sententiae* of this sort are more congenial to elegy than to epic (the elegiac distich being the very metre of epigram). Moreover, the very idea of defending a charming woman against moralizing old men is in the vein of elegy.

The structure of the following paragraph is particularly sophisticated. The demonstrative pronoun *haec* (313) connects the main character, who was just introduced, with the main action. This time the background is given in a subordinate temporal clause (*ubi*); the structure is more tightly woven than at the beginning with one long sentence filling no less than six lines. At the same time the great number of verbs adds to the vividness: *ubi* ... *processit* ... *et* ... *hausit,* ... *inrorat,* ... *tollit* ... (parenthesis: *putant*) ... *figit et* ... *edit* ... All the main

verbs are in the historic present. In this sentence there is threefold gradation:

1. two preparatory actions (secondary temporal clause),
2. ritual gestures (two main verbs),
3. Claudia looking at the image of the goddess and uttering her prayer (two main verbs again).

The third stage, though simply added with *-que*, is perceptibly separated from what precedes by a parenthesis reflecting the onlookers' reactions to Claudia's strange behaviour. This interruption of the sentence structure, combined with a change of viewpoint, creates a pause which gives more prominence to what will follow.

Claudia's own words (319-324), the first direct speech after the arrival in Italy, consists of three distichs:

1: an invocation of the goddess (319-320),

2: a bare statement of the facts (*casta negor*); she is ready to be punished if the goddess condemns her (321-322),

3: but, since she is innocent, she asks for a miracle to confirm it (323-324).

The miracle (325-328) is related in the historic perfect which the poet reserved for the crucial event. Ovid shows considerable mastery in combining and separating related elements. In line 325, the marginal position of the two verbs *dixit* and *traxit* produces a circular form: *dixit*, which looks to the past, is placed at the beginning, and *traxit*, which points to the future, stands at the end. After *traxit* a break adds to the suspense; this is the right place for a parenthesis announcing the miracle: "My story is a strange one, but it is attested by the stage"[1] (*mira, sed et scaena testificata loquar*). The first word after the parenthesis continues the interrupted action, but there is a change of perspective: *Mota dea est* ("the goddess was moved from the spot"). So far the poet has stuck to the historic perfect. The consequences of this extraordinary event are described, as is usual with our poet, in the historic present (three present tenses in 327-328). The poet's attention shifts again to the crowd which joyfully voices its approval.

In line 329 the poet switches to a later point in his narrative and starts anew in the historic present. The staccato style continues in the following lines. In a very short space, twice we have the sequence

---

[1] Translation: J.G.Frazer (London, 1929). See now: *Ovid in Six Volumes, Vol. 5: Fasti*, with an English translation by J.G.Frazer. Second edition revised by G.P.Goold (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1989).

pluperfect - present (331-334). These two distichs, which display a parallel structure, almost imperceptibly advance the action over a large measure of time. To form a powerful conclusion, the performance of rites is related in the perfect (334-336).

A new paragraph begins with a description of the setting (337-338) for which the present is used. The ritual bath of the goddess is then stressed by the perfect (340). There follows a colourful description of Claudia amidst the jubilant crowd (historic present: 341-344). The goddess rides in through the Porta Capena and Scipio Nasica receives her. These important events are related in the historic perfect, whereas the accompanying rain of flowers is given, of course, in the present.

Let us now sum up some features of the Ovidian text.

1. While the antecedents had been focused on the goddess, the section we examined more closely is dominated by Claudia. Ovid's interest in Claudia's justification has personal roots and chimes with the elegiac genre.

2. Although in other cases Ovid created symmetrical and "classical" forms (which is true even of many passages in the *Fasti*), in our text the structure of the narrative as a whole exhibits a studied asymmetry which might be called Alexandrian.[1]

3. The style of the narrative is dramatic;[2] coordination of sentences is more frequent than subordination, which is reserved for climactic points. There is much variation in the use of tenses: in accordance with epic practice,[3] the historic perfect proper is rarer than the historic present and is reserved for important events (in our case, mainly miracles and rites). Yet the (non-narrative) perfect is also used to make (author's) comments or statements.

4. The pace of Ovid's narrative is swift and reverberating. The elegiac distich favours Ovid's predilection for antithesis and pointed witticism.

---

[1] A (8 lines): arrival of the ship and of the crowd at the Tiber's mouth; the ship drawn into the Tiber by men; B (6 lines): the ship runs aground and cannot be moved by the men; C (8 lines): introduction of Claudia Quinta; D (6 lines): Claudia's gestures and announcement of her speech; E (6 lines): Claudia's speech; F (4 lines): the miracle; G (8 lines): stop at the bend of the Tiber; H (4 lines): ritual bath of the goddess; I (8 lines): procession into Rome.

[2] Cf. the distinction between *récit soutenu* and *récit dramatique* made by J.-P.Chausserie-Laprée, "Les structures et les techniques de l'expression narrative chez les historiens latins", *REL* 41 (1963): 281-296.

[3] S.Timpanaro, jr., "Forschungsbericht: Ennius", *AAHG* 5 (1952): 195-212, esp. 206, referring to: G.Pasquali, *Vecchie e nuove pagine stravaganti di un filologo* (Florence, 1952): 285-307.

5. Ovid, being interested in the story as an ætiological legend, does not omit the previous events (as Silius will do). The legend is presented in the form of a Callimachean dialogue with the Muse.

Silius' "Epic" Narrative

Lines 1-7, in indirect speech, give the content of the Sibylline Oracle. A mythological periphrasis (*Laomedonteae ... urbis*) briefly hints at Rome's relationship to Troy (Ovid had been more explicit: *Fasti* 4. 249-254). Silius stresses the moral qualities of the best Roman who has to receive the goddess (his name, Scipio Nasica, is mentioned only in line 10). The exclamation in line 7, which, at first glance, looks otiose, reveals Silius' moralistic viewpoint. The poet, who had stressed the moral decision of Africanus in 15. 18-130, now even alleges the superiority of moral victories over military triumphs.[1] This is not to deny the importance of Rome's feats in war, but to stress that the better part of them are the moral qualities which made them possible. As for its form, the introduction is separated from the rest of the text by the use of indirect speech (accusative and infinitive, subjunctive). The introductory lines which furnish the background (lines 1-2) are given, of course, in the pluperfect.

After this short exposition the narration starts with the arrival of the goddess in Italy. *Iamque* (line 8) marks a new starting point. Ernesti (ad loc.) found fault with Silius for having omitted the previous events, whereas Ruperti (ad loc.) weakly defended the poet by saying that the very size of his epic did not allow him to enter into every detail. We will see later that this omission is in harmony with Silius' poetic intentions, which differ from those of Ovid. For his narrative, Silius creates a background by using the imperfect tense (lines 8 and 10). He does not describe the crowd coming to meet the ship, but instead dwells again on Scipio Nasica's person and augments his importance by comparing him to the senate (9-10); though mentioned before Scipio, the senate is relegated to the second plane by an ablative absolute. The relevant facts are known from Livy (29. 14. 10-14), but this effective stylistic arrangement is Silius' own.

Then, a closer description (11-12) of the kinship of Nasica and Africanus duly stresses the old nobility of their family. A demon-

---

[1] Cf. 6. 545-546 (Marus' comment on Regulus' victorious martyrdom): *patientia cunctos / haec superat currus.*

strative pronoun (*isque*) connects the next sentence to what precedes. Nasica reverentially greets the foreign deity and has her ship brought to the Tiber's mouth. Although Silius stresses Nasica's role far more than Ovid, he does not use a main clause to describe his greeting the goddess. The temporal conjunction *ubi* shows that all of this is no more than preparation for the main action. The latter is given in an historic perfect: the ship is drawn up the river by women, an addition of Silius' own which emphasizes the role of the women and sets the stage for the Claudia theme.

Now the poet turns to the sounds of the procession (imperfect: line 19). There is less assonance and alliteration than in Ovid, but Silius is not entirely averse to this play (19-21 *ant - ant - Di - ca - co - Di - ant - ant*).

The ship running aground is described at surprising length (23-25): "Amid their wild cries and the prayers of the rejoicing multitude, the sacred ship refused to answer the pull of the ropes: she stopped suddenly and remained motionless on the river-bed"[1] *hos inter fremitus ac laeto uota tumultu / substitit adductis renuens procedere uinclis / sacra ratis subitisque uadis immobilis haesit.* Two historic perfects help to stress the importance of the moment (which is at the very centre of our text). The quoted sentence, in addition, is a typical example of what we observed in our previous chapter: here, once more, Silius avoids Ovidian staccato and by heaping up synonyms affects an "epic" fullness bordering on tautology. The facts, however, that until now the paragraphs have a length of five to seven lines and that the event of the ship getting stuck fills only three lines are proof of an attempt at relative (if not absolute) brevity.

With *tum* and a dramatic ellipsis of the verb (26) is introduced the priest's call who orders all the impure to remove their hands from the ropes and says that one pure woman would suffice to set the ship in motion. Unlike Ovid, Silius has the priest speak first and thereby renders Claudia's actions less surprising and her prayer better motivated than in Ovid. No wonder in Silius the sense of hierarchy, ritual propriety, and epic continuity is stronger than in Ovid.

By *hic* (line 33) the poet pinpoints the moment when Claudia can make her plea to the goddess. The introduction of the heroine is shorter than it is in Ovid; Silius does not mention the reason for the

---

[1] Translation: J.D.Duff, 2 vols. (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1927 and reprints).

calumny, Claudia's concern for her appearance, an idea alien to the style of epic, and instead, in accordance with the standards of the genre, insists on the heroine's noble lineage. In this paragraph participles are frequent (34-35), giving less prominence to individual elements and strengthening the coherence of the whole.

Claudia's prayer (36-40) which is effectively introduced by a verb in the historic present, is, on the one hand, more emotional than in Ovid (the insistence on the universal power of the goddess chimes with Silius' idea of epic as cosmic poetry: Homer's "poetry embraced earth and sea, the sky and the netherworld" *carmine complexus terram mare sidera manis*, 13. 788); on the other hand, Silius, ignoring Ovid's artful antitheses, condenses the essence of Claudia's request into two lines (39-40), which, for all their simplicity, are not devoid of art; witness the alliteration *crimine corpus* and the bold and felicitous phrase *facili me absolue carina*, four pregnant words which in J.D.Duff's translation become eleven: "Prove my innocence by the ease with which the vessel moves." How about: "Let a yielding boat prove my acquittal"?[1] *Tum* connects the following sentence. After Claudia has touched the rope (historic present), Silius interrupts himself: audible manifestations of divine presence (effectively separated from their context by a change from present to perfect) prepare the miracle. Only then are we told that the ship moves as fast as if a gust of wind had filled its sails. Here our epic poet's careful sentence connection gives way to asyndeton, which gains even more prominence by the initial position of the verb graphically given in the historic present: *fertur prona ratis* (44). The idea of swiftness suggested by the parenthetic wind simile is reinforced in the following line (45): the boat even anticipates Claudia's effort. Two final lines, still in the present tense, convey the importance of this legend to the subject of Silius' epic; especially note *finis* which occurs twice in line 47, cf. 17. 356 *ad finem uentum*.[2]

Silius versus Ovid

Let us now draw some conclusions, following the same order as in our analysis of Ovid.

---

1 This is Allan Kershaw's suggestion.

2 Bauer's *est* is not accepted by Delz.

1. In Silius, Claudia is less prominent than in Ovid. Her vindication, which was a matter of personal concern to the elegist, is not Silius' ultimate goal; the legend rather symbolizes the fact that Rome's morality has stood the test and that the victorious end of the great war is near at hand.

2. Unlike Ovid, Silius structures his narrative symmetrically.[1] Around a centre of three lines are placed two units of fifteen lines, themselves framed by an introduction and a finale each of seven lines. The proportion of each unit to the next large is n: (2n + 1), that is to say 3: 7: 15.

Symmetry is observed even in the details: the introduction consists of 2 + 5, the finale of 5 + 2 lines. The circular composition is highly symmetrical and can be taken as an expression of a classicistic frame of mind. Our text gives no reason to label the *Punica* as "mannerist" literature.

3. Interestingly enough, in our episode, Silius first uses the historic perfect and saves the historic present for Claudia and her miracle; in other words, he adopts the hierarchy of tenses which is common in prose. There are more discrepancies with Ovid: although dramatic effects are not lacking in Silius (witness the priest's call in line 26), his frequent use of conjunctions and connecting adverbs, secondary clauses and predicative participles shows the prevalence of continuous narrative. In Ovid almost all sentences are juxtaposed without connection, and the verbal function of participles is less perceptible than the attributive. In Silius there are fewer sudden changes of perspective or unexpected breaks in syntax; instead he dwells at greater length on things important to him, for his narration is based on the principles of epic, as will appear more clearly from style.

4. As an elegiac poet, Ovid prefers rhyme, whereas Silius, being an epic poet, is, for the most part, content with alliteration. Since these differences are partly conditioned by the choice of the metre, let us rather turn to a feature typical of Silius. In lines 23-25, the reader is surprised by the fullness of expression: *substitit* hardly differs in meaning from *renuens procedere* which, in its turn, is very close to *haesit.* On top of these three verbs Silius adds the adjective *immobilis.* Because of

---

[1] A: 7 lines (2 lines: the oracle; 5 lines: its content); B: 15 lines (5 lines: arrival of the ship: Nasica; 5 lines: the goddess received by Nasica; women draw the boat; 5 lines: the goddess's procession); C: 3 lines: the ship runs aground; B': 15 lines (7 lines: the priest's speech; 3 lines: preparation to Claudia's speech; 5 lines: Claudia's speech); A': 7 lines (5 lines: presence of the goddess and the miracle; 2 lines: interpretation).

such features, Silius' style was frequently called tautological, a verdict condensed by Eduard Norden into a single word: *Stumpfheit* ("dullness"). This is the only word Norden in his *History of Roman Literature* wastes on our poet.[1] Similarly in lines 46-47 there is not a world of difference between *finem armis* and *finem periclis uenire.* Line 23 resumes the immediately preceding paragraph, very probably for the sake of epic flow and continuity; in line 2 the adjectives *fatidicae* and *prisca* sound rather empty. In Nasica's introduction, the very last line is especially dull since splendid ancestry is no specific quality of Nasica's. To some extent "padded endings" seem to be typical of Silius. In the final lines of our text (46-47) the slowness of the spondees conspires with the fullness of expression to bring the narrative movement to a standstill. This is owing to his intention to create isolated pictures (I borrow the term from Friedrich Mehmel).[2] Long ago Ernesti, in his commentary, had spoken of Silius' "emblematic" technique. The idea of stopping the movement of a film in order to have the image stick in the reader's mind finds a parallel in the above-mentioned description of the ship getting stuck: in fact, the triple expression, in different aspects, gives a meditative account of the event. There is here a clash between Silius and the taste of his age, which carried to an extreme Ovid's fondness for epigrammatic endings.

Phenomena comparable with the features we observed in Silius have been shown in other writers to be typical of the style of old age,[3] a cautious and circumspect way of expression trying not to disturb the tranquillity of the reader's mind and not to involve him too much in the turmoil of action. Silius deliberately uses this device at crucial moments, while in other instances the action progresses at a fast pace (in his commentary on our text, Ernesti challenges Silius' brevity; whatever a less famous author does or does not is likely to be condemned).

Aiming at creating an epic which is an image of the world, Silius uses the relaxed and serene endings we described as a means of creating "distance". Among the Roman epic poets, Silius better than anyone understood the noble simplicity of Virgil's diction and tried,

---

[1] E.Norden, *Die römische Literatur. Mit einem Anhang: Die lateinische Literatur im Übergang vom Altertum zum Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 6th ed. 1961): 83.

[2] F.Mehmel, *Virgil und Apollonius Rhodius. Untersuchungen über die Zeitvorstellung in der antiken epischen Erzählung* (Hamburg, 1940 = *Hamburger Arbeiten zur Altertumswissenschaft* 1) and idem, *Valerius Flaccus* (diss., Hamburg, 1934).

[3] E.Staiger, *Adalbert Stifter als Dichter der Ehrfurcht* (Heidelberg, 1967): 37.

in his modest way, to imitate Homer's relaxed serenity. All of this separates him from Ovid,[1] Lucan, and his contemporary Statius and makes him an exponent of late-Flavian classicism.

5. Within the *Punica* our text opens the 17th Book, which, in our manuscripts, is the last book. Suggestions have been made that Silius originally wrote, or planned to write, eighteen books. What can an analysis of our text contribute to a solution of this question?

The first line runs: "In order to dislodge an invader from Italian soil" *Hostis ut Ausoniis decederet aduena terris.* This is especially appropriate as an opening line to the *last* book. Hannibal's leaving Italy is the contrary motif to his gradual approach to Rome, an idea which had dominated the earlier books.[2] This first line prepares the reversal of earlier battles in Hannibal's dream (158-169) where the dead Roman generals Flaminius, Gracchus, and Paullus come back to chase Hannibal from Italy. Equally relevant is the divine motivation of Hannibal's leaving Italy (204-206), which is in harmony with Claudia's miracle, the introductory oracle, and the sea storm invented by Silius. The last battle itself twice recapitulates the earlier great battles: witness Hannibal's speech (17. 295-337) and Scipio's taking revenge on those who vanquished the Romans at Trasimene and other places (487-490). At the end of the Claudia legend, Silius expressly announces the imminent end of war and peril. The same is true of the closing scene between Jupiter and Juno which prepares Hannibal's leaving the theatre of history. This scene in both function and position patently echoes Jupiter's and Juno's final dialogue in the *last* book of the *Aeneid.* The representation of Hannibal's flight, displayed in the triumphal procession, is reminiscent of the first line of Book 17, and the theme of triumph is anticipated in line 7; we come full circle. We already mentioned the moral meaning of the Claudia legend to the *Punica* as a whole. The beginning of the last book is a place especially appropriate for a message of such importance. All arguments point to the conclusion that, very probably, the Claudia legend was intended to open the final book of the *Punica,* where it realizes its full meaning. It follows that the amount of text missing in the lacuna in Book 17 was not very large and did not include two halves of books. The idea that Silius intentionally wrote only

[1] In other respects, the importance of Ovid's *Fasti* to Silius was rightly stressed by C.Santini, *La cognizione del passato in Silio Italico* (Rome, 1983) = *Silius Italicus and his View of the Past* (Amsterdam, 1991 = *London Studies in Classical Philology* 25).

[2] See my *Silius Italicus* (Amsterdam, 1964): 24-46.

seventeen books is, by the way, also supported by other arguments.[1] Hence, Silius either completely abandoned the plan of writing eighteen books or never conceived it.

Epilogue: In the present chapter, we focused our attention not on rhetoric but on generic differences. Such differences fall into the domain of "intertextuality" in the broader sense of the word. In the present case, generic conclusions can be drawn from an intertextual comparison (in the narrower sense of the word). It appears that Silius deliberately transposed the episode of Claudia Quinta from an elegiac into an epic context. In this regard, he agrees with Valerius Flaccus who, in the Io story, had reduced the erotic and elegiac implications. The political and historical undertones found in Silius' narrative show that he gave the episode a key position in his work and related it to the *Punica* as a whole and to the background of a universal epic horizon of Roman history (as evoked by Virgil in his historical tableaux and by Ovid in his quotation of Ennius (above, p. 147). In this regard, Silius' work can be compared to the last phase in the construction of a great cathedral planned by an early master, but built by generations. What is relevant in his work is the palpable presence of historical persons and facts and of geographical reality. All of this is elaborated in detail to adorn Virgil's architectural design and to fill it with life. The historical figures, by their real presence, confirm the truth of Virgil's prophecy (and of Silius' ethic view of history).

---

[1] E.Zinn, quoted in my *Silius Italicus,* pp. 133, n. 35 and 171, n. 11; moreover, there were seventeen *Epodes* of Horace. Other works consisting of 17 books: the Pindar edition of Aristophanes of Byzantium, Philochorus' *Atthis,* Asinius Pollio's *Historiae,* Strabo's *Geographica* (R.Häussler, *Das historische Epos von Lucan bis Silius und seine Theorie. Studien zum historischen Epos der Antike,* 2 [Heidelberg, 1978 = *Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften,* N.F. 2. 60]: 259, Excursus 9); Raymond Marks drew my attention to the fact that the acknowledged Virgilian Corpus comprises 17 books (*Eclogues*: 1 book; *Georgics*: 4 books; *Aeneid*: 12 books). Given the artistic principles exposed in our previous chapter (XII. 1: Intertextuality as Guiding Principle of Invention), Silius must have enjoyed the idea of equalling his admired master in this respect (should Martial's line [11. 50. 4] *Silius et uatem, non minor ipse, colit.* allude to size rather than to poetic stature?).

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

CLAUDIAN

Poetic Rhetoric and Intertextuality
Proserpina's Tapestry (Rapt. *1. 246-275*)[1]

Ipsa domum tenero mulcens Proserpina cantu
inrita texebat rediturae munera matri.
hic elementorum seriem sedesque paternas
insignibat acu, ueterem qua lege tumultum
discreuit Natura parens et semina iustis
discessere locis: quidquid leue, fertur in altum;
in medium grauiora cadunt; incanduit aër;
legit flamma polum; fluxit mare; terra pependit.
nec color unus erat: stellas accendit in auro,
ostro fundit aquas. attollit litora gemmis
filaque mentitos iamiam caelantia fluctus
arte tument: credas inlidi cautibus algam
et raucum bibulis inserpere murmur harenis.
addit quinque plagas: mediam subtegmine rubro
obsessam feruore notat; squalebat inustus
limes et adsiduo sitiebant stamina sole.
uitales utrimque duas, quas mitis oberrat
temperies habitanda uiris; in fine supremo
torpentes traxit geminas brumaque perenni
foedat et aeterno contristat frigore telas.
nec non et patrui pingit sacraria Ditis
fatalesque sibi Manes; nec defuit omen,
praescia nam subitis maduerunt fletibus ora.
coeperat et uitreis summo iam margine texti
Oceanum sinuare uadis; sed cardine uerso
cernit adesse deas imperfectumque laborem
deserit et niueos infecit purpura uultus
per liquidas succensa genas castaeque pudoris
inluxere faces: non sic decus ardet eburnum,
Lydia Sidonio quod femina tinxerit ostro.

Proserpine herself, soothing the house with sweet song, was sewing all in vain a gift against her mother's return. In this cloth she embroidered with

[1] The present chapter is dedicated to Miroslav Marcovich. It is based on my article: "Proserpina's Tapestry in Claudian's *De raptu*. Tradition and Design", *ICS* 14 (1989): 383-390. Text and translation: M.Platnauer, 2 vols. (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1922).

her needle the concourse of atoms and the dwelling of the Father of the gods and pictured how (250) mother Nature ordered elemental chaos, and how the first principles of things sprang apart, each to his proper place - those that were light being borne aloft, the heavier ones falling to a centre. The air grew bright and fire chose the pole as its seat. Here flowed the sea; there hung the earth suspended. Many were the colours she employed, tricking the stars with gold and flooding the sea (255) with purple. The shore she embossed with precious stones and cunningly employed raised threadwork to imitate the swelling billows. You might have thought you saw the seaweed dashed against the rocks and heard the murmur of the hissing waves flooding up the thirsty sands. Five zones she added; indicating that the centre was (260) the torrid zone by embroidering it with red yarn: its desert confines are parched and the thread she used was dried by the sun's unfailing heat. On either side lay the two habitable zones, blessed with a mild climate fit for the life of man. At the top and bottom she set the two frozen zones, portraying eternal winter's (265) horror in her weaving and the gloom of never-ceasing cold. Further she embroidered the accursèd seat of her uncle, Dis, and the nether gods, her destined fellows. Nor did the omen pass unmarked, for prophetic of the future her cheeks grew wet with sudden tears. Next she began to trace (270) Ocean's glassy shallows at the tapestry's farthest edge, but at that moment the doors opened, she saw the goddesses enter, and left her work unfinished. A glowing blush that mantled to her clear cheeks suffused her fair countenance and lit the torches of stainless purity. Not so beautiful even the glow of ivory (275) which a Lydian maid has stained with Sidon's scarlet dye.

Clearly, there are links between the description of Proserpina's tapestry, which begins with her father's house and ends with her husband's, and her own life. These two homes are, at the same time, different realms of the universe. Her tapestry gives an outline of the cosmos and shows the order in which its elements are arranged. Within this order, the earth takes pride of place, and rightly so since the tapestry is dedicated to Ceres, whose love for the earth sometimes borders on identification with it (cf. 3. 71-72 with 2. 171-172, and 2. 203).

It is especially appropriate that Claudian draws this picture in his 1st Book, since the order of the world, which Pluto threatens to undo, is at stake from the very beginning of the main action (1. 115-116).

As a new stage of Claudian's representation of the world, the general outline given on Proserpina's fabric will be enlivened in Book 2 by a more dynamic approach: on Proserpina's dress is to be seen the birth of sun and moon, and her walk through the meadows has the reader witness the birth as well as the death of flowers. Thus, the dimensions of time and change, which are essential to the life of nature and man on earth, are introduced in Book 2 to supplement the static image on the tapestry.

The picking of flowers, a recurring motif representing the death of mythic youths,[1] foreshadows the rape of Proserpina. The young goddess, "who loses the light of heaven," changes from Jupiter's world (the macrocosm) to Pluto's realm which, in his speech, and in the last part of Book 2, is described as a microcosm of its own. Significantly, the unchanging flowers of Elysium will be opposed to those of Henna (2. 289), which are subject to the law of birth and death.

With Book 3, a new chapter is opened, Ceres' wanderings over the earth, which will finally result in her giving agriculture to mankind. From heaven and underworld, the scenery is now transferred to earth, and Jupiter's speech introduces a new theme, the historical development of civilization. This second cycle of the work exhibits striking parallels to the first: Pluto's initial rebellion (1. 32-48) is matched by Ceres' sacrilegious violation of the sacred grove (3. 332-391). Pluto, in Book 1, had threatened to release the Titans (1. 55; cf. 1. 114). Mount Aetna which had been thrown onto a giant, serves to kindle Ceres' torches (3. 392-403). While Books 1 and 2 show Pluto changing from fury and anger to mildness and serenity, in Book 3 Ceres is furious and becomes calm only at the ending which, though lost, is known to us from the outlines given in Books 1 and 3 (1. 30 *unde datae populis fruges* together with Ceres' change from sorrow to joy, and 3. 50-51 *luctu ... laetata*). The "world" of Book 3 is "our" earth seen as the stage of suffering, history, and civilization.

From this overview we see that the description of Proserpina's tapestry, far from being an otiose embellishment, is tightly interwoven with her own life and that of her mother, who is the dedicatee.[2] Moreover, it reflects one of the author's main interests, to give a series of pictures of the universe in different aspects; and in this chain it is the first and basic link.

Society: Structure of Scenes

Having shown that the poem might be called "cosmic poetry" in different aspects—physical, vegetal, cultural, let us now turn to the social sphere. In Claudian's Olympus, a strictly hierarchical order reigns. There is no room for spontaneous activity; everything, down to

---

1 Cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 11. 68-71.

2 Arachne's tapestry had reflected her heretical view of the gods without immediate reference to her own life (her punishment is foreshadowed on Minerva's fabric): Ovid, *Met.* 6. 70-128.

the playful picking of flowers, has to be ordered from above. The supreme monarch, without any discussion, can impose sufferings on others and compel even the entire community of the gods to tell lies and to turn away from a clearly innocent person. Since everything has been ordained by the Parcae, or by Jupiter, who loves to quote them, discussion and even dialogue become almost impossible. These social conditions are reflected in the structure of scenes, which, quite consistently, break off after the authority has spoken.

Speeches (Excursus)

Consequently, instead of dialogue, we get speeches which, at their best, reflect the speaker's mind or, at their worst, are proclamations. To both types of speech an answer is usually superfluous. Of neither type of speech is persuasion the immediate goal: Jupiter need not persuade anybody since he will be obeyed, no matter how he speaks; Ceres cannot persuade anybody since she will not be obeyed, no matter how she speaks. The function of the first type of speech, therefore, will be to convey some ideas, not so much to the interlocutor as to the reader; the second type of speech will portray the character and her emotions. Ceres' speeches in some ways prefigure what much later will be called the inward monologue.

Similes I: Connection with the Larger Context

Two important similes frame our scene. In the introduction, Venus' path shines like a comet foreboding disaster.[1] The simile makes the reader aware of the fatal purpose of Venus' seemingly playful mission and thus puts the scene into a larger context.

The weaving scene ends with the appearance of the goddesses and with Proserpina blushing like ivory stained with purple. This simile, which is transferred from Virgil's Lavinia[2] to Proserpina, indirectly shows her to be a bride, as is confirmed by 2. 325, where *sollicitum pudorem* refers to the bride's blushes. In his story of the weaver Arachne, Ovid had also mentioned the maiden's blushing, but there the blush was rather a sign of pride, and the details of the simile were different (*Met.* 6. 46-49). That Claudian knew the Arachne story is

---

1 Cf. *Aen.* 10. 272, Aeneas' shield as seen by the Rutulians.

2 *Aen.* 12. 67-70; Statius, *Ach.* 1. 304-310; Homer, *Iliad* 4. 141-145 (where, however, the simile appears in a military context).

confirmed, last but not least, by the introduction of a spider which will try to complete the abandoned tapestry (3. 158). The place of the blush within the story is analogous to Ovid, but the details and the meaning of the simile are closer to Virgil: thus, Claudian shows us that he will rectify Ovid's heretical approach. His "carpet of Proserpina" becomes in a sense a palinode of Arachne's tapestry; in fact, while in Ovid we have two competing views on world, society, and art, in Claudian there is only one. On the other hand, Claudian is able to change Ovid also in the opposite direction, as we will see from his treatment of the Erysichthon legend.

Similes cannot be read without reference to certain predecessors; they demand an intertextual reading. Traditional contexts help to provide a frame of reference for the reader, and allusions to older poets give some signal as to the meaning.

Claudian used the similes discussed hitherto in functions or contexts roughly analogous to those of his predecessors, and the very parallels were meant to be helpful to the reader. The rainbow simile, however, which is very prominent in Ovid's Arachne story (*Met.* 6. 63-67), is displaced by Claudian. Ovid had shown Pallas and Arachne both weaving and using an entire palette of shades so similar that they are hard to distinguish; likewise, in a rainbow there are a thousand different colours, but the eye cannot detect the change from each one to the next; adjacent colours are very close, but the extremes are plainly different.

While Ovid had introduced this simile during the process of weaving, in Claudian it crowns (together with a peacock simile) the creation of flowers by Zephyrus (2. 97-100). The rainbow simile is not the only element which connects the 2nd Book with the tapestry in Book 1, thus revealing that the description of the world is continued on a new scale. There is also the description of Proserpina's garment in Book 2 which, showing the birth of sun and moon, introduces the themes of time and change relevant to this section.

Similes II: Interchange of Spheres

Let us now illustrate, in an excursus, a more sophisticated relationship between the main narrative and a simile, a relationship which sheds light on the structure of the poem as a whole.

In Book 3, which evidently starts a new main section of the *De raptu* (very probably what was meant to be the second half), Claudian

compares Ceres to Megæra and now uses for a simile what had been part of the main action in Books 1 and 2. There the Furies were roused by Pluto (1. 37-47);[1] at the marriage banquet they mixed the wine, while their snakes dangled into the bowl and partook of it, to be finally soothed with a gentle song; then the Furies kindled the wedding torches. This last description is part of the reverse world sketched by Claudian at the end of Book 2. The relaxing of the Furies is the opposite extreme to the situation at the beginning when they had been stirring up a revolution. Tisiphone's ominous torch of war (1. 40) is replaced by the unwonted wedding torches (2. 347). What had been the sphere of action in the first half of the work becomes the sphere of image in the second half: Ceres setting out to light her torches from Aetna is likened to Megæra who kindles her torches from the Phlegethon to punish Thebes or Mycenae. By her grief the goddess' character has been transmogrified: she is now an infernal monster. The technique of interchanging the spheres of action and of image had been used by Virgil: the real sea storm of Book 1 is matched by an entire series of wind and water images in Book 7 of the *Aeneid*;[2] in Book 1 Juno, through the forces of nature, had attacked the Trojans whereas in Book 7 she changes her tactics and sows the seeds of madness in human hearts through Allecto. Claudian clearly understood this pattern and adopted it. Thus, while in Book 1 Pluto and the Furies try to attack Olympus from the outside, in Book 2 it is the goddess Ceres herself, possessed by grief, who becomes like a Fury.

Let us now compare Claudian to his predecessors and ask what use he made of them.

Claudian and Virgil's Aeneid

For a work involving the underworld, the first model to be thought of is the 6th Book of the *Aeneid*. Claudian, who, for an epic poet, lays unusual stress on inspiration, assumes the role of Virgil's Sibyl who is possessed by Phoebus (*Rapt.* 1. 6; *Aen.* 6. 77); like her he urges the uninitiated to leave (1. 4; *Aen.* 6. 258), a context in which even Proserpina herself had been mentioned (*Aen.* 6. 251). Besides the role of the Sibyl, Claudian also takes the role of Virgil invoking the gods of the underworld, as his great predecessor had done (1. 20; *Aen.* 6.

---

1 Pallas thinks that they induced Pluto to rape Proserpina (2. 216).

2 Similarly, the real fire of Troy in Book 2 is reflected in the numerous light and fire similes of Book 8.

264). The new stress laid on the poet's identity with the inspired Sibyl reveals Claudian's intention to uncover the mysteries of the world. Correspondingly, the *sedes beatae* (*Aen.* 6. 39) take an important place in the *De Raptu,* especially in Pluto's speech to Proserpina, in which he begins, for obvious reasons, to depict that blissful site, quoting almost literally the lines devoted to the special sun and stars belonging to those places (2. 282-299; *Aen.* 6. 640-641). The meadows mentioned by Pluto (2. 287-289) remind us of *Aeneid* 6. 638; 642; 679; 684; the flowers (2. 289), however, seem to be a hybrid of the bee simile in *Aeneid* 6. 707-709 and the flowers of the Golden age in Ovid, *Met.* 1. 108. The tree bearing gold is mentioned as Proserpina's property in *Aen.* 6. 140-144 and in Claudian 2. 290-293. The idea of Proserpina judging the dead seems to be influenced by Ovid's Orpheus story, where she decides to release Eurydice.

No less important is the relationship of Ceres' dream of Proserpina (3. 80-110) to Aeneas' dream of Hector (*Aen.* 2. 268-297). Proserpina, once beautiful and happy, now looks wretched and mournful, as had Hector in Aeneas' dream. In both cases, though for different reasons, the apparition exhorts the dreamer to leave Troy. Book 4 of the *Aeneid* is also used to characterize both Proserpina and Ceres. For example, Proserpina's reproaches to Ceres strike notes similar to those of Dido to Aeneas (consider the mention of the tigress, 3. 105, *Aen.* 4. 367); Ceres, in her grief, metaphorically becomes a Mænad (*bacchatur* 3. 269), as Dido had done (*Aen.* 4. 301).

In many cases the relationship of Claudian's figures to Virgil's exhibits analogy of type and can therefore be called typological. In the inferno scene, however, there is deliberate contrast. The idea of introducing a blissful break by stopping the machinery of punishment for some happy moments had been anticipated by Virgil in his *Georgics* (4. 484) and by Ovid (*Met.* 10. 41-44), to whom we now turn.

Claudian, Virgil's Georgics, *and Ovid*

When Orpheus descended to the underworld, he changed it by his song. In the *Georgics* (4. 481-484) we read: "The very halls of Death were spellbound, and inmost Tartarus, and the Furies with livid snakes entwined in their locks. Cerberus held agape his triple mouth, and Ixion's wheel was stayed by the still wind."[1] And in the

[1] Translation: H.R.Fairclough (London and New York, 1916 and reprints).

Metamorphoses (10. 40-47): "As he spoke thus, striking the chords in accompaniment to his words, the bloodless spirits wept; Tantalus did not grasp at the fleeing wave; Ixion's wheel stopped in wonder; the vultures did not pluck at the liver; the Danaids rested from their urns, and you, Sisyphus, sat upon your stone. Then first, tradition says, conquered by the song, the cheeks of the Eumenides were wet with tears; nor could the queen, nor he who rules the lower world refuse the suppliant".[1] By Orpheus' song the laws of the underworld are changed; the sinners can rest from their punishments, and Pluto himself becomes mild. These ideas are expanded by Claudian throughout his underworld scene.

The passage from the *Georgics* is also echoed in the silence preceding Pluto's speech (*Rapt.* 1. 84-88), where it is combined with the epic tradition of the silence preceding the words of Jupiter (e. g. *Aen.* 10. 101-103). Yet there is clear evidence of Ovidian influence, too. In Ovid, the cause of Pluto's mildness had been Orpheus' reminding the regal pair that it was love which had joined them (10. 29), just as in Claudian where the change in Pluto's character is also effected by love. It was the later poet's innovation to expand the short-lived effect of Orpheus' song into a rather long festival on the occasion of Pluto's marriage to Proserpina and thus almost to turn hell into paradise. He might have felt entitled to do so all the more since Ovid's Orpheus had evoked the rape of Proserpina in the same context. Claudian enjoyed recreating the great primeval event of which Orpheus' momentary success was but a faint reflection. From the same scene, in which Proserpina is the first to be asked and the first to be moved, Claudian deduces Pluto's chivalrous idea to let his queen judge the dead (2. 302-304), a gesture quite in accord with the teachings of the *Art of Love*, i.e. to let one's mistress feel important as a benefactress (Ovid, *Ars* 2. 287-94). Orpheus' speech (*Met.* 10. 17-39, esp. 32-35), with its unconditional recognition of the universal power of death (and, therefore, of Pluto) is interestingly revived in the speech directed by Lachesis to Pluto (1. 55-62). This speech soothes Pluto for the first time and in so doing prefigures his later change. A second reminiscence of the same passage from Ovid turns up in Pluto's speech to Proserpina (2. 294-304) and is meant to console her by pointing out the extent of her future power. Ovid's Orpheus scene seems to be behind much of the invention of the *De Raptu*. The

---

[1] Translation adapted from: F.J.Miller, 2 vols. (London and New York, 1916 and reprints).

change of the underworld effected by Claudian makes him a rival to Orpheus, and, in fact, throughout the elegiac preface to Book 2, Claudian likens himself to the mythical bard.

In addition, there are meaningful references to the Golden Age (*Met.* 1. 89-106) whose people, according to Claudian, dwell in Elysium (2. 285-289). The everlasting flowers (2. 289), and their "better zephyrs" are strongly reminiscent of Ovid (*Met.* 1. 107-108). Claudian, however, adapts the motif to his main idea of opposing two worlds: we recall how he contrasted the everlasting flowers of Pluto's realm to the ephemeral flowers of Henna (2. 289).

While this development of Ovidian motifs, though powerful and original, does not contradict his predecessor's intentions, Claudian's variation of the Erysichthon theme puts him into radical opposition to Ovid and Callimachus (*Rapt.* 3. 332-391; Callim., *Hymn.* 6; Ovid, *Met.* 8. 738-842). Claudian has Ceres commit the very sin for which she had severely punished Erysichthon, her worst enemy. This daring reversal of what had been the central and most edifying tale of the Ceres hymn is, at the same time, highly affecting and deeply ironical. By alienating a motif which traditionally had served to enhance Ceres' majesty, the poet, with the utmost clarity, reveals the goddess' metamorphosis: her grief has made her completely unlike herself. In this case an intertextual approach conveys a meaning which is essential to both the content and the structure of the poem.

Claudian and Statius

Let us now turn to Statius. The introduction of Proserpina in her nubile maidenhood is strongly reminiscent of the way Statius had presented Deidamia to his readers. The parallel is all the more revealing since, later on, Claudian, unlike Statius, will stress innocence rather than the bloom of youth. The three goddesses to whom Statius had likened Deidamia are actually present in Claudian.[1] Nevertheless, he cannot resist the temptation to use them also for a simile. To make the comparison more believable, Statius imagines Minerva without her armour whereas Claudian imagines the young girl with the accoutrements of the goddesses, as Ovid had done (*Met.* 1. 695-697). Tellingly, he omits Venus from the comparison because this goddess

---

[1] The idea of two virginal deities assisting Venus in preparing a rape is, to say the least, surprising: later we are told that the honorable company of Pallas and Diana helped to disguise Venus' wiles.

is incongruous with Proserpina's virginity while, in Statius, the daring comparison to Venus is excused by the fact that the entire scene is viewed through the eyes of the young lover. If in Statius there is still room for personal feeling, in Claudian everything is arranged by the authorities, and Pluto has not even seen the girl he will have to rape and marry.

Even more important is the change of character produced by love. By love Pluto becomes *mitior* (307); the verb *mollescere* (313), in particular, is suggestive of Statius' *Achilleid* (1. 272 *mitescere*, 326 *mollit*) where a wild Achilles is changed by love, even to the point of putting on women's clothes. The interchange of specific characteristics of gender brought on by love[1] produces a shift in Pluto's temper and thus re-establishes cosmic harmony. The idea of a metamorphosis brought on by love is common to both Claudian and Statius. Yet the later poet uses reminiscences from Statius to achieve a different goal.

Claudian's New Approach

Claudian's picture of the world and society reflects the hierarchical structure of the late Roman Empire. The absence of discussion and often even of dialogue is a consequence of this situation. The same is true of his scenes, which can be viewed as isolated pictures. There is no competition of different world views, as there had been in Ovid, but a world unfolding in different aspects successively.

Much of Claudian's art in his description of different worlds can be explained by his adopting an unusual point of view. He even defamiliarizes his subject matter to the point of making it appear completely new to the reader. Such is the case with the underworld, which, first viewed through Pluto's loving eyes, looks almost like a paradise and then, on the unusual occasion of Pluto's and Proserpina's wedding, is turned upside down and becomes a rather jolly prison. Even more shocking is the reversal of Ceres' cult legend.

Also in detail, unusual perspectives add to the charm of the narrative: Jupiter is seen through the hate-filled eyes of his younger brother, who comments on his cruelty and polygamy (1. 93-116), and through the eyes of his mother, who knows the nature, if not the extent, of his slothfulness (3. 134-135).

---

[1] Cf., for instance, Pseudo-Apuleius, *Asclepius* 21, in a Platonic tradition.

Despite the use of different techniques and the assimilation of many traditions, Claudian's epic has a unity of its own. This is made possible by his fundamental intention of writing cosmic poetry in different successive aspects, rivalling, among other epic poems, the *Aeneid*. We have seen that the same is true of the *Georgics*, with regard to the theme (agriculture), the planned size (probably four books), and the relationship of the basic idea to Orpheus.

Epilogue: The poetic use of rhetorical techniques is especially successful in Claudian. Rhetorically speaking, the description of Proserpina's fabric is an excursus (*digressio*), but an excursus intimately linked to the body of the narrative. In the field of *elocutio*, an abundance of active verbs helps to turn a description into a live process, an achievement which goes far beyond the rhetorical exigencies of *euidentia* (ἐνάργεια). Masterpieces of defamiliarization through *elocutio* are the above-mentioned alluring descriptions of the underworld. The futility of rhetoric, a fact well-known to the readers in the imperial age, is revealed in many speeches of the *De Raptu*, which in this regard is comparable to Statius' *Achilleid*.

Intertextuality operates on more than one level. Proserpina's fabric in Claudian is an affirmative counterpart to Arachne's sacrilegious carpet in Ovid. Virgilian undertones convey the idea that Claudian, the author of a new *Georgics*, is a re-born Orpheus. This is a moving document of the new dignity achieved by Latin poetry in late antiquity. On the other hand, the pious Ovidian legend of Erysichthon's punishment is belied by Claudian's Ceres, who, in utter despair, violates her own sacred grove. Here, an example of intertextuality in the narrower sense of the word reveals, in addition, a clash of different systems of values ("intertextuality" in the broader sense of the word). The tragedy of Ceres as a mother lets her forget even her divine rank. Her sufferings are indicative of a chasm between absolute power and humanity and thus make her to some extent a figure of identification for the readers of the imperial epoch.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

CORIPPUS

Transformation of Epic Imagery[1]

Inmensam siluam laudum, uir iuste, tuarum,
aspiciens celsos nitor contingere ramos
grandiaque a summis decerpere poma racemis.
sed paruus maiora peto, nec prendere possum
mensuram trans fusa meam, longeque remota
suspicio mirorque uidens, et brachia tendo
ingenii studiique mei. stat fertilis arbor
sacrorum in medio nemorum, pulcherrima uisu,
per mundi spatium ramos quae tendit opacos,
fructibus omnigenis etiam sine tempore plena
et noua maturis admiscens germina pomis,
cuius apex summi contingit sidera caeli,
et radix de fonte bibit, sacrisque fluentis
expandit satiata comas et nubila supra est.
arboris et fontis, si fas componere magnis
parua datur, iustas uideor posuisse figuras.
sin aliter uidear, ueniam petit, optime quaestor,
simplicitas ignara mali. tu fertilis arbor
Augusto de fonte bibens: fons maximus aulae est
communis benefactor erus, fons omnia ditans,
qui tua per latas eduxit brachia terras
et populos uestra requiescere fecit in umbra.
hoc mihi da de fonte bibam: tu pabula praebes,

[1] Text and Translation: *Panegyricus in laudem Anastasii quaestoris et magistri*, in: *In laudem Iustini,* second preface, 1-51. Editions: Flavius Cresconius Corippus, *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris,* ed. with translation and commentary by Averil Cameron (London, 1976; edition quoted here). Flavii Cresconii Corippi *Iohannidos* seu *De bellis Libycis libri VIII.* Ediderunt I.Diggle et F.R.D.Goodyear (Cambridge, 1970); Flavii Cresconii Corippi Africani grammatici quae supersunt recensuit M.Petschenig (Berlin, 1886 = Berliner Studien für classische Philologie und Archaeologie 4, 2) (still important). On textual problems: V.Tandoi, "Note alla Iohannis di Corippo", *SIFC* n.s. 52 (1980): 48-89; 54 (1982): 47-92; R.Jakobi, "Kritisches und Exegetisches zur *Iohannis* des Coripp", *Hermes* 117 (1989): 95-119. A good edition of the 1st Book: *Flavii Cresconii Corippi Iohannidos liber primus. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a cura di* M.A.Vinchesi (Napoli, 1983 = Koinonia 9). Books and Articles: E.Burck, "Die *Johannis* des Corippus", in: E.Burck (ed.), *Das römische Epos* (Darmstadt, 1979): 379-399; H.Hofmann, Cornelius van Arckel und sein Coripp-Kommentar, *Philologus* 134 (Berlin, 1990): 111-138; P.Speck, "Marginalien zu dem Gedicht *In laudem Iustini Augusti Minoris* des Corippus, *Philologus* 134 (Berlin, 1990): 82-92.

fons mihi dulcis aquas. haec inter amoena libenter
nutriar et uestra satiatus protegar umbra,
summe magistrorum, procerum decus, arbiter orbis,
principis auspicio leges et iura gubernans,
iustitiae uindex, inopum pater, omnia curans
iudiciis releuare piis, qui munera temnis,
spernis auaritiam, fuluum qui respuis aurum,
quaestor Anastasii, quem Christi munere fidum
cognouit princeps geminoque ornauit honore.
felix est totus Iustino principe mundus,
felix haec aetas, in qua Sapientia regnat,
felices populi te iudice, quos facis ipse
sub dominis gaudere piis. generaliter orbi
quamquam prouideas, miseri specialiter Afri
in te oculos atque ora ferunt: agit Africa grates
et uestram iam sentit opem, gaudetque quod ampla
semper Anastasii referunt solacia ciues:
me quoque gaudentem, quaestorum maxime, redde.
quod labor indulsit, quod fessis prouida Musis
alma per insomnes meruit uigilantia noctes,
hi sacri monstrant apices. lege, summe magister,
et causam defende meam. tibi sanctio uestrum
commendat famulum. uestro de fonte creatur
riuulus iste meus, sub cuius nomine gesto
principis officium. fessae miserere senectae,
uulneribusque meis solita pietate medere,
ut grates tibi laetus agam, sacrosque triumphos
principis inuicti felici carmine dicam.

"When I gaze upon the great wood[1] of your praises, just one, I struggle to touch the lofty branches and pick the large fruit from the topmost clusters. But I am small and they are too great for me; I cannot take what is beyond my capacity. I look at them from afar (5) and marvel as I see them, and stretch out the arms of my ability and enthusiasm. A fertile tree stands in the middle of a sacred grove, very beautiful to see, stretching its dense boughs over the whole space of the earth, laden with fruit of all kinds even out of season, (10) and mingling new buds with ripe fruit. Its top touches the stars in the highest heavens, and its root drinks from a spring, and filled with the holy waters it spreads out its foliage and its top is in the clouds. If it is right to compare the small with the great, (15) I have in the tree and the spring suggested the right images. But if I should be thought to have done otherwise, honoured *quaestor*, I seek pardon on the grounds of my simplicity, innocent of evil. You are the fertile tree, drinking from the imperial spring. Our lord and common benefactor is the great spring of the court, the spring that enriches all, (20) which stretched your branches over the wide earth and let the people rest in your shade. Grant to me that I may drink from this spring. You supply me with food, the sweet spring with water. May I gladly be nurtured amid these pleasances and being sated may

[1] The huge dimensions of the subject matter.

I be protected by your shade, (25) greatest of *magistri*, glory of our leaders, guide of the world, watching over law and justice under the auspices of the emperor, champion of justice, father of the needy, striving to mitigate all ills by pious judgements, you who spurn bribes, turn your back on greed and reject yellow gold too, (30) *quaestor* Anastasius, whom the emperor saw to be loyal through the gift of Christ, and honoured with dual office. Happy is the whole world with Justin as emperor, happy this age in which Wisdom rules, happy the people with you as judge, the people whom you yourself make to rejoice (35) under pious rulers. Although your concern is for the world as a whole, the unhappy Africans especially raise their eyes and their faces to you. Africa gives thanks and already feels your aid, and rejoices because the citizens are continually talking about the generous comforts they have received from Anastasius. (40) Make me rejoice too, best of *quaestors*. This holy decree shows what my labour has given me, what blessed farsighted vigilance has earned me by sleepless nights even when my Muse was weary. Read, honoured *magister*, and plead my case. The decree commends (45) to you your servant. From your fountain springs that stream of mine, you under whose name I perform my duty for the emperor. Pity my weary old age and heal my wounds with your habitual piety, so that I may thank you in happiness and proclaim the holy triumphs (50) of the unconquered emperor in happy song."

Tree and Water as figurae

The panegyric on Anastasius, the second preface to the *In Laudem Iustini*, is evidently a piece of panegyric rhetoric.[1] It is built on the image of a huge tree representing the unlimited subject matter of Anastasius' praise. *Silua* (line 1) means the same as the Greek ὕλη ("wood for construction", metaphorically, "subject matter"). Yet, the poet plays on the other meaning of *silua* (which is "woods"[2]) and at the same time suggests the idea of a huge tree which, by itself, is equivalent to an entire grove of ordinary trees (recalling Erysichthon's oak in Ovid, *Met.* 8. 744, which is "itself a grove": *una nemus*). Not unlike the little boy in Oscar Wilde's *Selfish Giant*, the poet is unable to reach the tree's branches. The full fruits in the upper branches are too high for him to grasp, and the word *racemis*, which usually applies to vines, suggests Æsop's fable of the sour grapes. The helpless author can only stretch out the arms of his talent and zeal (lines 6-7). There follows a description of a fertile tree, touching the

---

[1] Some typical aspects are the *dubitatio* at the beginning (the subject is too great for the modest talent of the orator), the raising of pity (ἐλεεινόν) towards the end, the praise of the addressee's prosperity and of his virtues (especially his generosity) in the centre.

[2] Cameron exaggerates the confusion by saying "the praises of Anastasius are like a forest" (123).

sky with its top and nourishing its roots from a fountain. The details partly evoke *Psalm* 1.[1] Though slightly reminiscent of Virgil, *Aen.* 4. 445-446,[2] this description is not a simile. It is called a *figura* by the author himself (line 16), which evidently means an allegory, since Corippus goes on to explain that the tree is Anastasius, and the fountain is the Emperor. The Emperor made Anastasius rich and powerful; so all over the world the people can rest in the shade of this "tree". The allegory leads to a plain request: "let me drink from this fountain" (line 23). Some lines later (46-47), the poet comes back to the idea of the fountain from which his modest stream flows. At first glance, there is no consistency in the application of the image since *uestra ... in umbra* by the context is distinct from *principis* and must mean Anastasius alone (cf. A.Cameron *ad loc.*). This interpretation, however, poses several difficulties; *uestra* (22) has to be taken as a singular, which would be very unusual in epic; *cuius* would have no noun as antecedent. Fortunately, there is a way of getting rid of these grammatical difficulties and, at the same time, of the inconsistency of the imagery. If we take *uester* literally, it means "of you both", which does make sense since the money and the power are the Emperor's and are administered by Anastasius. Again, if we relate *cuius* to the noun (*riuulus*) to which it naturally refers, we get the explicit explanation of the image which is in keeping with the poet's custom (cf. lines 15-17): "under the name of the stream (I mean) the imperial office I hold".

In this introduction there is no simile; the imagery appears in the form of metaphor and continuous metaphor which is allegory. As happens with fables or parables, the allegory is explained.

A Dialogue with Virgil: Groups of Similes

Corippus will adhere to both the tree and the water imagery throughout his work. To give an example, the guards of the Emperor stand "like oaks on both sides of a river" (3. 172-176). One source of this simile can be traced with absolute certainty, since Corippus, strangely enough, calls the oaks *coniferae.*[3] Oaks and conifers had been

---

[1] Consider the psalmist's tree, which yields its fruit in its season and whose leaf does not wither (*Ps.* 1. 3), and Corippus outdoing the psalmist. The same is true of the psalmist's delight in the law of the Lord (*Ps.* 1. 2) and Coripp. 1. 26-29 and 35.

[2] Corippus, by introducing the fountain (from *Ps.* 1. 3), spoiled Virgil's neat antithesis between top and roots.

[3] Cameron translates "leafy" which supposes *frondiferae*, another suggestion

mentioned together by Virgil (*Aen.* 3. 679-681) to represent the terrifying hoard of the Cyclopes; on the other hand, the idea of trees standing near a river is found in *Aen.* 9. 679-682.

In Book 1. 124-129 an elaborate simile shows the change in the behaviour of the senators who, at a sign from Calinicus, suddenly cease to weep for the dead Emperor. Corippus evokes a river which has broken a dyke and overflows into the fields, but can be led back into its borders by a cautious farmer, who makes new dykes. The details of the simile are difficult: if the broken dyke is repaired, the water will not find its way back into the river; Corippus may be excused either if we think of additional dykes built at the new bounds or if we understand *si* (line 125) as an abstract condition, not a particular measure taken in the immediate context. Yet another difficulty remains; the water, when enclosed within its banks, will not be restrained nor lose its impetus, but become more rapid. Clearly Corippus, even when inventing a simile, was not much concerned about details. In all likelihood he was more interested in presenting the symbolic aspects: an authoritative senator calming a group of people, just as Neptune in the *Aeneid* (1. 148-153) had calmed the storm. The slight incongruity of Corippus' text results from the crossing of this Virgilian simile with another passage from the *Aeneid*: Virgil's description of the Nile returning to its bed after having overflowed into the surrounding fields (*Aen.* 9. 30-32).

The same Virgilian simile will be the starting point for another passage in Corippus. In the last book, an *adynaton* (4. 168-172) involves a parallel between the Nile and the Emperor: the gifts and praises of both are inexhaustible. The mention of the Nile points to *Aen.* 9. 30-32 (cf. also Lucan, e.g. 6. 272-278). Corippus, therefore, beginning with the preface, stays with the water imagery; the Nile is especially suitable for his purpose since it implies greatness and the divine power of granting life and fertility.

It should be mentioned by now that one of the last similes in Corippus' work helps to explain the meaning of the difficult first simile in Book 1. In 4. 215-223, the people wait for the Emperor to show himself just as the peasants in Libya wait for the rain, opening and closing their channels as necessary. This simile, which gives a surprising turn to the expectation of rain as shown in *Aen.* 12. 451-455, sheds some light on the first simile in Book 1: here also Corippus

---

would be *glandiferae*. Unfortunately the Virgilian source bids for the conclusion that the mistake was Corippus' own.

might be thinking of precautionary measures in expectation of a flood. Once again, Corippus eliminates the sinister elements present in Virgil and uses different Virgilian passages to build a symbolical structure of his own.

Another simile (1. 229-237) likens the dead Justinian to a venerable tree which has fallen. *Cadens* is, strangely enough, supposed to have preterite meaning here, like πεσών; the little birds, while bemoaning the old tree, already search for a new place to live. This charming simile in an original way continues the tradition marked by Virgil's felled tree symbolizing Troy (*Aen.* 2. 626-631), by his description of Priam's corpse (*Aen.* 2. 557-258), and Lucan's venerable, yet decayed oak tree representing Pompey (Lucan 1. 135-143). We will come back to the birds for which, in general, there is also a Virgilian precedent, though the psychological detail is original.

Up to now, not only each single simile, but also the similes as a group follow a "Virgilian" pattern. The closeness to Virgilian tradition is underlined by Justin's constant epithet *pius*, by an epic dream scene (1. 28-67), by epic descriptions of works of art,[1] and by the allegory of Fama (Coripp. 1. 298; Virgil, *Aen.* 4. 173-188). Of course Corippus omits the sinister connotations this figure has in Virgil.

Resurrection and Solar Symbolism

The same is true of the simile of resurrection which shows the continuity from father to son. As a snake stripped of its old skin has become young again, Neoptolemus seems to be his father re-born (Virgil, *Aen.* 2. 471-475). This simile, because of its negative implications, was unsuitable for Corippus. Instead, he chose the wonderful Phoenix image which we know from Ovid (*Met.* 15. 392-407) and Lactantius.[2] Justin is greeted by the people as if Justinian re-born; similarly, the birds greet the new Phoenix as their king (Coripp. 1. 349-360). The birds surrounding the Phoenix, again, are an addition of Corippus (as compared to Ovid), and serve to connect the last two similes:[3] Corippus strives for consistency.

---

[1] 1. 276-293: a tapestry representing Justinian's exploits; 3. 112-133: tableware similarly illustrated; architectural descriptions: 1. 97-111; 3. 179-230; 4. 264-287: the Hagia Sophia (though more a praise than a description).

[2] A.Wlosok, "Wie der Phoenix singt", in: *Musik und Dichtung*, Festschrift V.Pöschl (Frankfurt, 1990): 209-222.

[3] The birds are also mentioned when the morning is described (1. 199-201).

Still in Book 1, the solar imagery of Book 2 is prepared for by the comparisons of the circus with the year (1. 330-333) and of the colours of the circus teams with the four seasons (1. 314-329). Reference had also been made to the palace as "house of the sun" (1. 101); these latter themes are Ovidian (*Met.* 2. 1-18; 23-30; 15. 199-213).

In the 2nd Book, two parallel prayers (the Emperor invoking Christ, the Empress invoking the Virgin) are followed, in reverse order, by two parallel similes. The Empress is compared to the moon, the Emperor to the sun. The moon simile (2. 73) is combined with a double tree simile to show the happy relationship of mother and daughter (78-83). Virgil had hinted at a similar relationship beween mother and daughter in the Latona-Diana simile applied to Dido (*Aen.* 1. 498-502). The solar image describing Justinian (2. 92) exhibits verbal parallels to the simile in *Aen.* 1. 586-593, introduced at the moment when the cloud is disrupted and Aeneas appears in all his beauty and shining brilliance; one might also think of *Aen.* 4. 143-150, where Aeneas is compared to Apollo. There is every reason to believe that Corippus consciously demythified the Virgilian similes, avoiding the names of Apollo and Diana while retaining, and even enhancing, the underlying symbolism of nature.

Very interesting is the comparison of the Emperor's erect bearing to the letter "I", which, as the first letter of his name, is '"his" letter (2. 139). The upright stance of man (Coripp. 2. 22; Ovid, *Met.* 1. 84-88) through Christianity has become a symbol of resurrection:[1] hence, this stance especially befits the Emperor, who is an image of the rising sun[2] and of Christ risen. The Emperor on his shield looks like the sun (2. 149). Thus, the name (Justin - "Sun of Justice")[3] is not the only link between the Emperor and Christ.

Justin in his speech develops an allegory of the Empire as a kind of a human body, the Emperor, of course, being the head (2. 186-274).

The acclamations of the people in the circus are well organized; they lift up their right arms and lower them "as dense waves[4] surge forward with their white sleeves" (2. 315-316). The movements which accompany the songs are illustrated by another simile comparing the crowd to a grove of conifers moved by the East Wind. When the

---

1 A.Wlosok, *Laktanz und die philosophische Gnosis* (Heidelberg, 1960).

2 2. 291; 3. 179; 4. 251-252. For the Emperor as image of the *Pantokrator* (*omnipotentis imago*): 2. 428.

3 Cameron to line 156-157 (with bibl.).

4 The waves moving to and fro: *Aen.* 11. 624-628.

crowd becomes silent, it is likened to a stormy sea calmed by a gentle breeze and finally silent out of respect for the sun. These similes, though original in some details (such as the "sleeves" of the waves) on the whole adhere to the epic tradition which knows such images as the sea becoming white (*Aen.* 7. 528), or rolling to and fro (*Aen.* 11. 624-628), nodding oaks (*Aen.* 9. 679-682), waving conifers (*Aen.* 3. 679-681), and wind rustling in the woods (*Aen.* 10. 97-99). The calming of a sea storm is an especially crucial Virgilian image (1. 148-153). Corippus has combined this motif with the imperial solar imagery, enhancing the symbolism of nature, as he had done in previous similes.

The Byzantine general Narses is compared to the morning star (3. 220-230) outshining the other heavenly bodies and announcing the day. By its romantic touch, this simile, which is applied to Pallas in *Aen.* 8. 589-591, differs from most epic-style similes; Corippus has related the simile to his imperial solar symbolism and thereby made Narses a precursor of Justin. Retaining the natural symbolism, he eliminated the pagan name Venus and, all the more, Lucifer, which to a Christian ear had a sinister ring; by writing "morning star", Corippus found common ground between biblical language, the epic tradition, and what might be called a natural manner of expression. Hierarchic thought will equally dominate a second Narses simile (4. 368) where, in a meaningful modification of *Aen.* 1. 592-593, Narses is likened to agate or marble encased in gold. Agate was thought to be the stone of friendship, and this symbolism in late antiquity was applied to Aeneas' companion Achates.[1] This comparison both exalts Narses and intimates that he is subordinate to the Emperor.

Towards the end of the work, the Emperor's eyes are said to shine like the sun sending his light from the Ocean. If Corippus thought of the sun rising from the Ocean, he describes something he had never seen; if we take *diem* not to mean "daylight" but simply "light" we might also think of a reflection of the sun on the Ocean at any time of the day. Yet, the rising sun would be an image most appropriate to the new Emperor (4. 251-254).[2]

---

[1] T.Weber, *Fidus Achates. Der Gefährte des Aeneas in Vergils Aeneis* (Frankfurt, 1988 = *Studien zur Klassischen Philologie* 37): 11-13 (with mention of Corippus among others).

[2] According to W.Ehlers, Corippus prepares his readers for a main scene which, however, he does not describe directly; instead he introduces a simile: W.Ehlers, "Epische Kunst in Coripps *Iohannis*", *Philologus* 124 (1980): 109-135. In his later work Corippus avoided repetitions, which are found in the *Iohannis*.

Most typically, Corippus likens (3. 179-190) the imperial palace and its officials to the sun encircled by its planets. This un-Virgilian image of cosmic order conveys the main idea of Corippus' work.

Birds and Souls

In Book 3 the women mourning for Justinian are compared to birds gathering in the fall, but still hesitating to leave (3. 50-54). The point is their great number; Corippus is appropriately reminiscent of *Aen.* 6. 309-312, where exactly the same image illustrates the innumerable crowd of souls near the entrance to the underworld. Corippus wishes his readers to catch the parallel between his funeral scene and *Aeneid* 6. Retrospectively we understand that this simile is a source for the bird similes in the preceding books which all refer to a multitude of persons or, to use the Christian term, souls.

City Life, Rural Life and Labour

The ambassadors of the Avares entering the palace are compared to tigers who, when entering the circus, are impressed by the crowd. They forget their ferocity and are proud of being looked at (3. 231-254). As opposed to the fierceness of barbarians, the Roman people is imagined as a "body politic"; the civilized character of the Roman nation is reflected in labour. Imagery drawn from the human body is intertwined with agricultural motifs (2. 238-244): the state enriches persons of achievement like the fat soil rewards the peasants' labour. In Book 4, an elaborate bee simile reflects the activity of men felling trees; it is a variation of *Aen.* 1. 430-436, where the image is applied to the Carthaginians building their city.[1]

The senators, accepting their gifts from the Emperor, are compared to peasants carrying home flowers (4. 148-153). The season is important, the flowers being the first gifts of the year (151). The mention of the fertile soil (148) reminds us of the farmer simile (2. 238) in which the state had been compared to the earth which rewards the peasants for their toil. In connection with Justin, the thought of Virgil's *iustissima tellus* did not seem all too far-fetched. The recurring similes from rural life suggest some closeness to the

---

[1] Cf. A.D.Leeman, *Form und Sinn. Studien zur römischen Literatur* (Frankfurt, 1985 = *Studien zur Klassischen Philologie* 15): 203-211 ("Bäumefällen - Vergil als Glied in der antiken epischen Tradition"). Leeman's article contains excellent remarks on other epic poets, but does not mention Corippus.

Georgics; in this context the initial use of the inspiration topos (the poet being inspired by the imperial family)[1] and the fact that there are four books might be of interest.

The Good Shepherd and the Swallow

Finally, the Emperor is compared to a good shepherd; the entire simile has a biblical ring (4. 198-205), but is not out of tune with the epic tradition. Virgil had occasionally compared Aeneas and Pallas to shepherds,[2] though he did not elaborate on this image as a symbol of imperial behaviour; the idea of kings as shepherds of the people is already familiar in Homer. Here again Corippus chooses language compatible with both Christian and epic tradition.

The monarch is also like a swallow (cf. Coripp. 4. 256-263) returning to feed her hungry nestlings. In *Aen.* 12. 473-477, the swallow simile is placed immediately after the expectation of the rain (cf. Coripp. 4. 215-223). While Virgil laid the stress on the swift movement of the swallow, Corippus concentrates on the feeding of the young and thus depicts Justin as the provider for his people. In Corippus the swallow simile shows a perfect mother and becomes a portrait of a specific virtue. The word *distribuit* (263) is indicative of Justin's *iustitia distributiua.*

Epilogue: The imagery in Corippus is partly drawn from epic tradition, partly from the Bible. Purely biblical images are rare, and if they are used, they are not out of tune with common experience and the poetic tradition (for instance the good shepherd). Numerous are the images which epic tradition and Christianity have in common, such as the imagery derived from trees, fountains, light. In our estimation, the most interesting group are Virgilian similes adapted by Corippus to his new context. Some Virgilian similes generate in Corippus entire groups of new similes (the Nile, the birds). In other cases Corippus shows that he is aware of the Virgilian context connecting two similes into a group (the Aeneas and Dido similes related to Apollo and Diana viz. sun and moon, or the rain and the swallow in *Aeneid* 12).[3]

---

1 Again, Corippus gets rid of mythological gods, but keeps the invocation of human beings.

2 Excellent remarks on kingship in the *Aeneid* in F.Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic*, (Cambridge, 1989): especially 20 (with bibl.) and 32.

3 For the structural importance of the similes in Corippus and for his Virgilianism: J.Blänsdorf, "*Aeneadas rursus cupiunt resonare Camenae.* Virgils epische Form in

Moreover, the allusion to the agate proves that he was familiar with commentaries on Virgil. Corippus contrived what may be properly called a "conversion" of the Virgilian similes by stripping his imagery of sinister implications, eliminating pagan mythology,[1] and elaborating even more clearly the symbolism of nature and cosmology (for which he drew largely on Ovid). Above all, he concentrated on the portrayal of specific virtues, focusing everything on the Emperor and, behind him, on Christ.

Corippus' transformation of epic style is not limited, therefore, to intertextuality in the narrower sense of the word, but it reveals both change and continuity of cultural patterns. This impression is confirmed by his use of descriptions and dream scenes, as well as by his interpretation of *pietas* as an attribute of Justin. Centred as it is on the life and welfare of the country and the people, Corippus' poem is also reminiscent of Virgil's *Georgics*: there is a constant reference to country life, the poetic inspiration is explicitly said to come from the court, there are long didactic passages, and there are four books. It follows that Corippus made a serious effort to be to his Christian Emperor what Virgil had been to Augustus,[2] thus revitalizing serious Latin poetry.[3] Therefore, the epic and didactic elements in Corippus' work seem to deserve more attention than they have been paid. Corippus' critical use of Virgilian motifs and his search for a common denominator between epic and biblical imagery shows that intertextuality (in the narrower sense of the word) may be indicative of clashes or convergencies between different cultural systems (i. e. of "intertextual" relationships in the broader sense of the word). His systematic transformation of Virgil's similes is part of a complete transformation of the epic genre.

---

der *Iohannis* des Corippus", in: *Monumentum Chiloniense. Studien zur Augusteischen Zeit.* Festschrift E.Burck (Amsterdam, 1975): 524-545. See further: M.Lausberg, "*Parcere subiectis.* Zur Virgilnachfolge in der Johannis des Coripp", *JbAC* 32 (1989): 105-127 (also on Corippus' knowledge of rhetoric). Corippus christianized historical epic; on his use of Lucan: W.Ehlers, "Epische Kunst in Coripps *Iohannis*", *Philologus* 124 (1980): 109-135.

[1] A typical feature is the fact that Corippus limits the use of *numen* to pagan contexts: J.U.Andres, "*Numen* in der *Johannis* des Coripp", in: *VChr* 48 (1994): 65-77.

[2] On the *Iohannis* as an epic poem representative of Justinian's Rome: D.Romano, "L'ultimo epos latino. Interpretazione della *Iohannis* di Corippo", *AAPal* 4. 27. 2 *Lettere* 1966-1967 (1968): 5-37.

[3] Corippus' earlier work, the *Iohannis*, had been written as a piece of Byzantine propaganda for the inhabitants of North Africa: A.Cameron, "Corippus' *Iohannis*: Epic of Byzantine Africa", in: *PLLS* 4 (1983, published 1984): 167-180.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations Used when Quoting Editions: T: Text; Tr: Translation; C: Commentary; N: Notes.

General

P.J.Aicher, *Homer and Roman Republican Poetry* (diss. Chapel Hill, 1986).

M.v.Albrecht, *A History of Roman Literature. From Livius Andronicus to Boethius. With Special Regard to Its Influence on World Literature,* 2 vols. (Leiden, 1997).

C.R.Beye, *Ancient Epic Poetry. Homer, Apollonius, Virgil* (Ithaca and London, 1993).

M.Billerbeck, "Stoizismus in der römischen Epik neronischer und flavischer Zeit", *ANRW* 2, 32, 5 (1986): 3116-3151.

C.M.Bowra, *From Virgil to Milton* (London, 1945, repr. 1963).

J.Boyle (ed.), *Roman Epic* (London, 1993).

W.W.Briggs, Jr., "Virgil and the Hellenistic Epic", *ANRW* 2, 31, 2 (1981): 948-984.

E.Burck, "Das Menschenbild im römischen Epos" (1958), in: H.Oppermann (ed.), *Wege zu Vergil* (Darmstadt, 1963): 233-269.

E.Burck (ed.), *Das römische Epos* (Darmstadt, 1979).

C.Burrow, *Epic Romance. Homer to Milton* (Oxford, 1993).

F.Cairns, M.Heath (eds.), *Roman Poetry and Prose. Greek Rhetoric and Poetry* (Leeds, 1993).

W.V.Clausen, *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry* (Berkeley, 1987).

C.Conrad, "Traditional Patterns of Word-Order in Latin Epic from Ennius to Virgil", *HSPh* 69 (1965): 195-258.

G.B.Conte, *Memoria dei poeti e sistema letterario* (Torino, 1974, 2nd ed. 1985).

P.Dubois, *History, Rhetorical Description and the Epic. From Homer to Spenser* (Cambridge, 1982).

G.E.Duckworth, *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Virgil* (diss. Princeton, 1933).

D.C.Feeney, *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* (Oxford, 1991).

P.Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius* [misleading title: this is a useful book on poetic descriptions of works of art] (Leipzig, 1912).

K.Galinsky (ed.), *The Interpretation of Roman Poetry. Empiricism or Hermeneutics?* (Frankfurt, 1992).

J.Gassner, *Kataloge im römischen Epos. Vergil–Ovid–Lucan* (diss. München, 1972).

R.Gordesiani, *Kriterien der Schriftlichkeit und Mündlichkeit im homerischen Epos* (Frankfurt, 1986).

J.B.Hainsworth, *The Idea of Epic* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford, 1991).

P.Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid. Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986).

P.Hardie, *The Epic Successors of Virgil. A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* (Cambridge, 1992).

R.Häussler, *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil* (Heidelberg, 1976).

R.Häussler, *Das historische Epos von Lucan bis Silius* (Heidelberg, 1978).

R.Heinze, *Virgil's Epic Technique,* Engl. Transl. with a Preface by A.Wlosok (London, 1993).

G.Huber, *Lebensschilderung und Kleinmalerei im hellenistischen Epos. Darstellung des menschlichen Lebens und der Affekte* (diss. Basel, 1926).
W.Kirsch, "Probleme der Gattungsentwicklung am Beispiel des Epos", *Philologus* 126 (1982): 265-288.
F.Klingner, "Catulls Peleus-Epos" (1956), repr. in: F.Klingner, *Studien zur griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Zürich, 1964): 156-224.
E.C.Kopff, "Vergil and the Cyclic Epics", *ANRW* 2, 31, 2 (1981): 919-947.
W.Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart, 1924, repr. 1964).
G.Lieberg, *Zu Idee und Figur des dichterischen Schöpfertums* (Bochum, 1985).
F.Mehmel, cf. Virgil and Valerius Flaccus.
G.Möhler, *Hexameterstudien zu Lukrez, Vergil, Horaz, Ovid, Lukan, Silius Italicus und der Ilias Latina* (Frankfurt, 1989).
J.K.Newman, *The Classical Epic Tradition* (Madison, 1986).
V.Pöschl, cf. Virgil.
C.Reitz, *Zur Gleichnistechnik des Apollonios von Rhodos* (Frankfurt, 1996).
W.Schetter, *Das römische Epos* (Wiesbaden, 1978).
W.Schubert, *Jupiter in den Epen der Flavierzeit* (Frankfurt, 1984).
W.Suerbaum, "Zum Umfang der Bücher in der archaischen lateinischen Dichtung: Naevius, Ennius, Lukrez und Livius Andronicus auf Papyrus-Rollen", *ZPE* 92 (1992): 153-173.
I.Tar (ed.), *Epik durch die Jahrhunderte. Internationale Konferenz Szeged 2.-4. Oktober 1997* (Szeged, 1998 = *Acta Antiqua et Archaeologica* 27).
K.Thraede, *Der Hexameter in Rom. Verstheorie und Statistik* (München, 1978).
P.Toohey, *Reading Epic* (London, 1992).
H.L.C.Tristram (ed.), *New Methods in the Research of Epic–Neue Methoden der Epenforschung* (Tübingen, 1998 = *ScriptOralia* 107).
M.Wigodsky, *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry* (Wiesbaden, 1972).
G.Williams, *Change and Decline. Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1978).
K.Ziegler, *Das hellenistische Epos. Ein vergessenes Kapitel griechischer Dichtung* (Leipzig, 1934); 2nd ed. with an appendix: *Ennius als hellenistischer Epiker* (Leipzig, 1966).
E.Zinn, *Die Dichter des alten Rom und die Anfänge des Weltgedichts* (1956), repr. in: H.Oppermann (ed.), *Römertum* (Darmstadt, 1962): 155-187.
E.Zinn, *Epilogue* to: *Vergil, Aeneis,* transl. by R.A.Schröder (Frankfurt and Hamburg, 1963): 312-322.
E.Zinn, *Viva Vox. Römische Klassik und deutsche Dichtung* (Frankfurt, 1994).

Livius Andronicus

Editions: E.H.Warmington (TTr), *ROL* 2: 1-43. *Odusia*: S.Mariotti (in his book, see below). M.Lenchantin De Gubernatis (crit.T) (Torino, 1937). *FPL* 7-17 Morel, 9-18 Büchner, 17-38 Blänsdorf; cf. *FLP* 45-46 Courtney ("Livius refictus").

Lexicon: A.Cavazza, A.Resta Barrile, *Lexicon Livianum et Naevianum* (Hildesheim, 1981).

Bibl.: G.Erasmi 1975 (see below).

W.Beare, "When Did Livius Andronicus Come to Rome?", *CQ* 34 (1940): 11-19.
G.Broccia, *Ricerche su Livio Andronico epico* (Padova, 1974).

K.Büchner, "Livius Andronicus und die erste künstlerische Übersetzung der europäischen Kultur", *SO* 54 (1979): 37-70.
U.Carratello, *Livio Andronico* (Roma, 1979).
H.Dahlmann, "Studien zu Varro *De poetis*", *AAWM* 10 (1962; Mainz, 1963): 28-39; 43-57.
G.Erasmi, *Studies on the Language of Livius Andronicus* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1975; repr. London, 1982: bibl.)).
G.Erasmi, "The Saturnian and Livius Andronicus", *Glotta* 57 (1979): 125-149.
E.Flores, "Sull'interpretazione del *frg.* 18 M.^{2} e le dimensioni dell'*Odusia* di Andronico", in: *Filologia e forme letterarie. Studi offerti a F.Della Corte* (Urbino, 1987): 9-19.
E.Flores, "L'*Odissea* di Omero e la traduzione di Livio Andronico", *Lexis* 4 (1989): 65-75.
E.Fraenkel, "Livius 10a", *RE* Suppl. 5 (1931): 598-607.
U.Knoche, "Über die Aneignung griechischer Poesie im älteren Rom", *Gymnasium* 65 (1958): 321-341, esp. 325-334.
F.Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur,* vol. 1 (Berlin, 1913): 55-75.
S.Mariotti, *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica. Saggio critico ed edizione dei frammenti dell'Odyssea* (Milano, 1952; Urbino, 2nd ed. 1986).
W.Schetter, *Das römische Epos* (Wiesbaden, 1978): 15-18.
A.Seele, *Römische Übersetzer. Nöte, Freiheiten, Absichten. Verfahren des literarischen Übersetzens in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Darmstadt, 1995).
W.Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter. Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius* (Hildesheim, 1968): 1-12; 297-300.
W.Suerbaum, "Zum Umfang der Bücher in der archaischen lateinischen Dichtung", *ZPE* 92, 1992, esp. 168-173.
A.Traina, *Vortit barbare. Le traduzioni poetiche da Livio Andronico a Cicerone* (Roma, 1970): 10-28.
J.H.Waszink, "Tradition and Personal Achievement in Early Latin Literature", *Mnemosyne ser.* 4, 13 (1960): 16-33.
J.H.Waszink, "Zum Anfangsstadium der römischen Literatur", *ANRW* 1, 2 (1972): 869-927.

Naevius

Editions: E.V.Marmorale, *Naevius poeta. Introd. bibliogr., testo dei frammenti e commento* (Firenze 1945; 3rd ed. 1953). E.H.Warmington (TTr), *ROL* 2 (London, 5th ed. 1961): 46-155. *Bellum Poenicum*: W.Morel, *FPL* (Lipsiae, 2nd ed. 1927): 17-29. *FPL* 20-40.Büchner; 38-71 Blänsdorf; cf. *FLP* 3 Courtney. S.Mariotti, *Il Bellum Poenicum e l'arte di Nevio. Saggio con edizione dei frammenti del Bellum Poenicum* (Roma, 1955). M.Barchiesi, *Nevio epico. Storia, interpretazione, edizione critica dei frammenti* (Padova, 1962). L.(= W.)Strzelecki (Lipsiae, 1964).

Lexicon: A.Cavazza, A.Resta Barrile, *Lexicon Livianum et Naevianum* (Hildesheim, 1981).

M.von Albrecht, "Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum*", in: E.Burck (ed.), *Das römische Epos* (Darmstadt, 1979): 15-32.
M.Barchiesi, 1962, see editions.
V.Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms. Untersuchungen zum Bellum Poenicum und zur Aeneis* (Heidelberg, 1963).

K.Büchner, "Der Anfang des *Bellum Poenicum* des Naevius", in: K.Büchner, *Humanitas Romana. Studien über Werke und Wesen der Römer* (Heidelberg, 1957): 13-34.

K.Büchner, "Das Naeviusproblem. Mythos und Geschichte", in: K.Büchner, *Resultate römischen Lebens in römischen Schriftwerken* (= *Studien zur römischen Literatur*, vol. 6) (Wiesbaden, 1967): 9-25.

K.Büchner, "Römische Geschichte und Geschichte der römischen Literatur", in: K.Büchner, *Römische Prosa* (= *Studien zur römischen Literatur*, vol. 9) (Wiesbaden, 1978): 1-26, on Naevius pp. 1-3 (first in *ANRW* 1, 2 (1972): 759-780).

E.Fraenkel, "Naevius", *RE* Suppl. 6 (1935): 622-640.

H.Fränkel, "Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen", *Hermes* 70 (1935): 59-72.

R.Häussler, *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil. Studien zum historischen Epos der Antike, 1.Teil: Von Homer bis Vergil* (Heidelberg, 1976): 92-120.

A.Mazzarino, "Appunti sul *Bellum Poenicum* di Nevio", *Helikon* 5 (1965): 157-158; 6 (1966): 232-236; 639-644.

W.Richter, "Das Epos des Gnaeus Naevius. Probleme der dichterischen Form", *NAWG* 1 (1960): 3.

W.Schetter, *Das römische Epos* (Wiesbaden, 1978): 18.

L.Strzelecki, *De Naeviano Belli Punici carmine quaestiones selectae* (Kraków, 1935).

Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen* (see above, "General"): 13-42.

G.Villa, "Problemi dell'epos neviano. Passaggio dall'archeologia mitica alla narrazione storica", *RAIB* 64 (1977-1978): 1, 119-152.

J.H.Waszink, "Zum Anfangsstadium der römischen Literatur", in: *ANRW* 1, 2 (1972): 869-927.

Ennius

Editions: J.Vahlen, *Ennianae poesis reliquiae* (Lipsiae, 1854; 2nd ed. 1903; with *Index sermonis*; repr. 1967). E.H.Warmington (TTrN), *ROL* 1 (1935, 2nd ed. 1956 (rev.), repr. 1967). *FLP* 4-43 Courtney. *Annales*: E.M.Steuart (TN), (Cambridge, 1925). M.Bandiera (*Ann. Book 1*, TC), (Firenze, 1978). O.Skutsch (TC, fundamental), (Oxford, 1985).

Bibl.: S.Timpanaro, *Ennius*, *AAHG* 5 (1952): 195-212.

M.von Albrecht, "Ennius' *Annales*", in: E.Burck (ed.), *Das römische Epos* (Darmstadt, 1979): 33-44.

M.Bettini, *Studi e note su Ennio* (Pisa, 1979).

C.O.Brink, "Ennius and Hellenistic Worship of Homer", *AJPh* 93 (1972): 547-567.

C.J.Classen, "Ennius: Ein Fremder in Rom", *Gymnasium* 99 (1992): 121-145.

A.Cordier, *Les débuts de l'hexamètre latin. Ennius* (Paris, 1947).

Ennio tra Rudiae e Roma. Atti del convegno nazionale A.I.C.C., Lecce, 12-13 novembre 1994 (Galatina 1994).

Ennius. Sept exposés par O.Skutsch (and others) = Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 17 (Fondation Hardt, Vandœuvres, 1971) (Genève, 1972).

A.Grilli, *Studi enniani* (Brescia, 1965).

R.Häussler, *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil = Studien zum historischen Epos der Antike, 1: Von Homer zu Vergil* (Heidelberg, 1976).

H.D.Jocelyn, "The Poems of Quintus Ennius", *ANRW* 1, 2 (1972): 987-1026.

H.von Kameke, *Ennius und Homer* (diss. Leipzig, 1926).

K.Kleve, "Phoenix from the Ashes: Lucretius and Ennius in Herculaneum", in: Ø.Andersen, H.Whittaker (eds.), *The Norwegian Institute of Athens: The First Five Lectures* (Athens, 1991): 57-64.

N.Krevans, "Ilia's Dream: Ennius, Virgil, and the Mythology of Seduction", *HSPh* 95 (1993): 257-271.
A.Lunelli, "Postille inedite di Vahlen alla seconda edizione di Ennio", *RFIC* 108 (1980): 55-84; 174-217 (repr. with corr. and ind. 1988).
S.Mariotti, *Lezioni su Ennio* (1951; repr. Torino, 1963).
J.K.Newman, "*Memini me fiere pavum.* Ennius and the Quality of Roman Aesthetic Imagination", *ICS* 8 (1983): 173-193.
E.Norden, *Ennius und Vergilius* (Leipzig, 1915).
L.M.Oostenbroek, *Eris–Discordia. Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der ennianischen Zwietracht* (Pijnacker, 1977) (with bibl.).
G.Pasquali, "Ennio e Virgilio", *GGA* (1915): 593-610, repr. in: G.P., *Vecchie e nuove pagine stravaganti di un filologo* (Firenze, 1952): 285-307.
R.Reggiani, *I proemi degli Annales di Ennio. Programma letterario e polemica* (Roma, 1979).
W.Röser, *Ennius, Euripides und Homer* (diss. Würzburg, 1939).
F.Skutsch, "Ennius", *RE* 5 (1905): 2589-2628.
O.Skutsch, *Studia Enniana* (London, 1968).
O.Skutsch, "Book VI of Ennius' *Annals*", *CQ* 81 n.s. 37 (1987): 512-514.
Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen* (see above, "General").
S.Wiemer, *Ennianischer Einfluß in Vergils Aeneis VII-XII. Beitrag zu einem Vergil-Kommentar* (diss. Greifswald, 1933).
G.Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Literature* (Oxford, 1968): 359-363.
K.Ziegler, *Das hellenistische Epos* (see above, "General").
O.Zwierlein, "Der Ruhm der Dichtung bei Ennius und seinen Nachfolgern", *Hermes* 110 (1982): 85-102.

Virgil

Editions: Io.L.de la Cerda (TC) 3 vols., (Lugduni, 1612-1619; commentary not yet fully replaced). C.G.Heyne (important), G.P.E.Wagner (TC), 5 vols. (Lipsiae, 1830-1841). T.E.Page (TC), 3 vols. (London, 1896-1900). T.Ladewig, K.Schaper, P.Jahn, P.Deuticke (TC), 3 vols. (Berlin, 1: 8th ed. 1907; 2: 13th ed. 1912; 3: 9th ed. 1904). J.Conington, H.Nettleship, F.Haverfield (TC), 3 vols. (London, 1: 5th ed. 1898; 2: 4th ed. 1884; 3: 3rd ed. 1883). H.R.Fairclough (TTrN) (London, 1916 and reprints). R.Sabbadini, L.Castiglioni, M.Geymonat (Torino, 3rd ed. 1973). R.A.B.Mynors (Oxford, 1969).

Aeneid: J.W.Mackail (TN) (Oxford, 1930). C.Day Lewis (Tr) (Oxford, 1952 and reprints). D.West (Tr) (Harmondsworth, 1990). *Aen. 1 and 2*: A.Weidner (C) (Leipzig, 1869). *Aen. 1*: R.S.Conway (TC) (Cambridge, 1935). R.G.Austin (TC) (Oxford, 1971). G.Stégen (TC) (Namur, 1975). *Aen. 2*: R.G.Austin (TC) (Oxford, 1964). *Aen. 3*: R.D.Williams (TC) (Oxford, 1962). *Aen. 4*: A.S.Pease (TC) (Cambridge, Mass., 1935; repr. 1967). R.G.Austin (TC) (Oxford, 1955). *Aen. 5*: R.D.Williams (TC) (Oxford, 1960). *Aen. 6*: E.Norden (TTrC, authoritative) (Leipzig, 3rd ed., 1926; repr. 1994). R.G.Austin (TC) (Oxford, 1977). *Aen. 7 and 8*: C.J.Fordyce (TC) (Oxford, 1977). *Aen. 8*: P.T.Eden (C) (Leiden, 1975). K.W.Gransden (TC) (Cambridge, 1976). *Aen. 9*: E.T.Page (TC) (London, 1938). *Aen. 10*: R.J.Forman (C) (Ann Arbor, 1973). S.J.Harrison (TTrC) (Oxford, 1991). *Aen. 11*: H.E.Gould (TC) (London, 1964). K.W.Gransden (TC) (Cambridge, 1991). *Aen. 12*: W.S.Maguinness (TC) (London, 3rd ed., 1964).

Ancient Vitae: C.Hardie (Oxford, 1957). G.Brugnoli, F.Stok (Roma, 1997).
Ancient Commentaries: G.Thilo and H.Hagen, *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1881-1887).

Indices and Dictionaries: M.N.Wetmore, *Index verborum Vergilianus* (New Haven, 2nd ed., 1930; repr. 1961). H.Merguet, *Lexikon zu Vergilius mit Angabe sämtlicher Stellen* (Leipzig, 1912; repr. 1960). M.Wacht, *Concordantia Vergiliana*, 2 vols. (Hildesheim, 1994). *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* (Roma, from 1984 onward).

Bibl.: W.Suerbaum, "Hundert Jahre Vergil-Forschung. Eine systematische Arbeitsbibliographie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der *Aeneis*", *ANRW* 2, 31, 1 (1980): 1-358. M.T.Morano Rando, *Bibliografia virgiliana* (Genova, 1987).

M.von Albrecht, "Einheit und Vielfalt von Vergils Lebenswerk", *Gymnasium* 90 (1983): 123-143.
Atti del Convegno virgiliano di Brindisi, 1981 (Perugia, 1983; collection of articles).
A.Barchiesi, *La traccia del modello* (Pisa, 1985).
G.Binder, *Aeneas und Augustus. Interpretationen zum 8. Buch der Aeneis* (Meisenheim, 1971).
M.Bonfanti, *Punto di vista e modo di narrazione nell'Eneide* (Pisa, 1985).
P.Boyancé, *La religion de Virgile* (Paris, 1963).
F.E. Brenk, "The Gates of Dreams and an Image of Life: Consolation and Allegory at the End of Virgil's *Aeneid VI*", in: C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* (Bruxelles, 1992): 277-294.
V.Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms. Untersuchungen zum Bellum Poenicum und zur Aeneis* (Heidelberg, 1963).
K.Büchner, "P.Vergilius Maro", *RE* 8 A 2 (1958): 1266-1486 (1487-1493 appendix on the funeral games by E.Mehl).
E.Burck, "Vergils *Aeneis*", in: E.Burck (ed.), *Das römische Epos* (Darmstadt, 1979): 51-119.
F.Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge, 1989).
W.V.Clausen, *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry* (Berkeley, 1987).
G.B.Conte, *Il genere e i suoi confini. Cinque studi sulla poesia di Virgilio* (Torino, 1980).
G.B.Conte, *The Rhetoric of Imitation* (Ithaca, 1986).
G.D'Anna, *Virgilio. Saggi critici* (Roma, 1989).
J.Ferguson, "Vergil and Philosophy", *PVS* 19 (1988): 17-29.
G.K.Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome* (Princeton, 1969).
G.K.Galinsky, "The Anger of Aeneas", *AJPh* 109 (1988): 321-348.
D.Gall, *Ipsius umbra Creusae–Creusa und Helena* (Stuttgart, 1993).
R.Gaskin, "Turnus, Mezentius and the Complexity of Virgil's *Aeneid*", in: C.Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* (Bruxelles, 1992): 295-316.
M.Gigante (ed.), *Virgilio e gli Augustei* (Napoli, 1990; collection of articles).
R.Glei, *Der Vater aller Dinge. Interpretationen zur politischen, literarischen und kulturellen Dimension des Krieges bei Vergil* (Trier, 1991).
K.W.Gransden, *Virgil: The Aeneid* (Cambridge, 1990).
S.Grebe, *Die vergilische Heldenschau. Tradition und Fortwirken* (Frankfurt, 1989).
J.Griffin, *Virgil* (Oxford, 1986).
P.Grimal, *Virgile ou la seconde naissance de Rome* (Paris, 1985).
T.Halter, *Form und Gehalt in Vergils Aeneis. Zur Funktion sprachlicher und metrischer Stilmittel* (München, 1963).
P.R.Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid. Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986).
S.J.Harrison, *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford, 1990).
R.Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik* (Leipzig, 3rd ed. 1914; repr. 1994), fundamental; see now:

R.Heinze, *Virgil's Epic Technique*, Translated by H. and D.Harvey and F.Robertson, with a Preface by A.Wlosok (Bristol, 1993).
J.Henry, *Aeneidea, or Critical, Exegetical, and Esthetical Remarks on the Aeneid*, 4 vols. (London, 1873; Dublin, 1889).
F.V.Hickson, *Roman Prayer Language. Livy and the Aeneid of Vergil* (Stuttgart, 1993).
N.Horsfall, *Virgilio: L'epopea in alambicco* (Napoli, 1991).
W.R.Johnson, *Darkness Visible. A Study of Virgil's Aeneid* (Berkeley, 1976).
G.Klemke, *Beobachtungen zur Vergilischen Parataxe: Das Phänomen der Entfaltung in der Aeneis* (Frankfurt, 1990).
F.Klingner, *Virgil. Bucolica. Georgica. Aeneis* (Zürich, 1967).
G.N.Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer, Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils, mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis* (Göttingen, 1964).
W.F.Jackson Knight, *Roman Virgil* (Harmondsworth, 2nd ed. 1966).
R.O.A.M.Lyne, *Further Voices in Virgil's Aeneid* (Oxford, 1987).
R.O.A.M.Lyne, *Words and the Poet. Characteristic Techniques of Style in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford, 1989).
C.J.Mackie, *The Characterization of Aeneas* (Edinburgh, 1988).
F.Mehmel, *Virgil und Apollonius Rhodius. Untersuchungen über die Zeitvorstellungen in der antiken epischen Erzählung* (Hamburg, 1940).
R.C.Monti, *The Dido Episode and the Aeneid. Roman Social and Political Values in the Epic* (Leiden, 1981).
J.J.O'Hara, *Death and Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid* (Princeton, 1990).
H.Oppermann (ed.), *Wege zu Vergil* (Darmstadt, 2nd ed. 1976).
B.Otis, *Virgil. A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford, 1964; repr. 1967).
A.Parry, "The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*", *Arion* 2 (1963): 66-80.
V.Pöschl, *Die Dichtkunst Virgils. Bild und Symbol in der Äneis* (1950; English ed.: *The Art of Vergil*, Ann Arbor, 1962), Berlin, 3rd ed. 1977 (modified).
V.Pöschl (ed.), *2000 Jahre Vergil. Ein Symposion* (Wiesbaden, 1983).
E.Potz, "*Pius furor* und der Tod des Turnus", *Gymnasium* 99 (1992): 248-262.
M.C.J.Putnam, *The Poetry of the Aeneid* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965).
M.C.J.Putnam, "Virgil's Inferno", *MD* 20/21 (1988): 165-202.
K.Quinn, *Virgil's Aeneid. A Critical Description* (London, 1968).
C.Renger, *Aeneas und Turnus. Analyse einer Feindschaft* (Frankfurt, 1985).
R.Rieks, *Affekte und Strukturen. Pathos als Form- und Wirkungsprinzip von Vergils Aeneis* (München, 1989).
F.Robertson, *Meminisse iuvabit: Selections from the Proceedings of the Virgil Society* (Bristol, 1988).
W.Schadewaldt, "Sinn und Werden der Vergilischen Dichtung" (1930), repr. in: H.Oppermann (ed.), *Wege zu Vergil*, 43-68.
R.R.Schlunk, *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid* (Ann Arbor, 1974).
F.Serpa, *Il punto su Virgilio* (Roma, 1987).
R.A.Smith, *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil* (Ann Arbor, 1997).
H.-P.Stahl, "Aeneas–an 'Unheroic' Hero?", *Arethusa* 14 (1981): 157-177.
G.Thome, *Gestalt und Funktion des Mezentius bei Vergil* (Frankfurt, 1979).
A.Thornton, *The Living Universe: Gods and Men in Virgil's Aeneid* (Leiden, 1976).
T.Weber, *Fidus Achates. Der Gefährte des Aeneas in Vergils Aeneis* (Frankfurt, 1988).
P.Wigodsky, *Virgil and Early Latin Poetry* (Wiesbaden, 1972).
R.M.Wilhelm, H.Jones (eds.), *The Two Worlds of the Poet. New Perspectives on Vergil* (Detroit, 1992).
G.Williams, *Techniques and Ideas in the Aeneid* (New Haven, 1983).
R.D.Williams, *Virgil* (Oxford, 1967).
R.D.Williams, *The Aeneid* (London, 1987).
W.Wimmel, *Hirtenkrieg und arkadisches Rom. Reduktionsmedien in Vergils Aeneis* (München, 1973).
A.Wlosok, *Die Göttin Venus in Vergils Aeneis* (Heidelberg, 1967).

A.Wlosok, "*Et poeticae figmentum et philosophiae veritatem*. Bemerkungen zum 6. Aeneisbuch, insbesondere zur Funktion der Rede des Anchises (724 ff.)", *LF* 106 (1983): 13-19.

F.J.Worstbrock, *Elemente einer Poetik der Aeneis. Untersuchungen zum Gattungsstil vergilianischer Epik* (Münster, 1963).

E.Zinn, "Epilogue to: Vergil, *Aeneis*", Tr. by R.A.Schröder (Frankfurt, 1963): 312-322, repr. in: E.Zinn, *Viva Vox* (Frankfurt, 1994): 185-196.

Ovid

Editions: *Opera omnia*: N.Heinsius (Amstelodami, 1652; 2nd ed. 1658-1661). R.Ehwald, F.Levy (= Lenz), 3 vols. (Lipsiae, 1888-1924). A.Palmer, G.M.Edwards, G.A.Davies, S.G.Owen, A.E.Housman, J.P.Postgate, in: J.P.Postgate (ed.), *Corpus poetarum Latinorum 1* (Londini, 1894; separate: Londini, 1898). G.Showerman, rev. by G.P.Goold (TTrN), 6 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1977-1989).

Met.: R.Merkel (Lipsiae, 2nd ed. 1875). H.Magnus (Berlin, 1914). M.Haupt, R.Ehwald, O.Korn (TC), 2 vols., 1: Zürich, 10th ed. 1966, 2: 5th ed. 1966 (corr., bibl. add. by M.von Albrecht). G.Lafaye (TTr), 3 vols. (Paris, 3rd ed. 1961-1963; rev., corr.). F.Bömer (C), 7 vols. (Heidelberg, 1969-1986). W.S.Anderson (Leipzig, 1977, 7th ed. 1996). M.von Albrecht (TTrN) (Stuttgart, 1994). *Met. 1*: A.G.Lee (TN) (Cambridge, 1953). *Met. 2*: J.J.Moore–Blunt (C) (Uithoorn, 1977). *Met. 8*: A.S.Hollis (TC) (Oxford, 1970). C.Tsitsiou (C, study) (diss., Heidelberg, 1998; forthcoming).

Concordance: R.J.Deferrari, M.I.Barry, M.R.P.McGuire, *A Concordance of Ovid* (Washington, 1939).

Bibl.: E.Martini, *Einleitung zu Ovid* (Prag, 1933). W.Kraus, "Forschungsbericht", *AAHG* 11 (1958): 129-146; 16 (1963): 1-14; 18 (1965): 193-208. M.von Albrecht, "Forschungsbericht", *AAHG* 25 (1972): 55-76; 267-290; 26 (1973): 129-150. O.Pasqualetti, A.Manzo, "Rassegna critica di bibliografia ovidiana", *Aevum* 47 (1973): 305-317. A.G.Elliott, "Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. A Bibliography 1968-1978", *CW* 73, 7 (1979-1980): 385-412. J.R.C.Martyn (1981; see below). H.Hofmann, "Ovids *Metamorphosen* in der Forschung der letzten 30 Jahre (1950-1979)", ibid. 2161-2273.

F.Ahl, *Metaformations. Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets, Ithaca* (1985).

M.von Albrecht, Die Parenthese in Ovids *Metamorphosen* und ihre dichterische Funktion (Hildesheim, 1964).

M.von Albrecht, E.Zinn (eds.), *Ovid* (Darmstadt, 1968).

M.von Albrecht, *Ovid*, Stuttgart (forthcoming).

A.Barchiesi, *Il poeta e il principe. Ovidio e il discorso augusteo* (Rome and Bari, 1994).

L.Barkan, *The Gods Made Flesh. Metamorphosis and the Pursuit of Paganism* (New Haven, 1986).

J.Barsby, *Ovid* (Oxford, 1978).

A.Bartenbach, *Motiv- und Erzählstruktur in Ovids Metamorphosen. Das Verhältnis von Rahmen- und Binnenerzählungen im 5., 10. und 15. Buch von Ovids Metamorphosen* (Frankfurt, 1990).

J.W.Binns (ed.), *Ovid* (London, 1973).

M.Boillat, *Les Métamorphoses d'Ovide. Thèmes majeurs et problèmes de composition* (Berne, 1976).

S.D'Elia, *Ovidio* (Napoli, 1959).

M.Dippel, *Die Darstellung des trojanischen Krieges in Ovids Metamorphoses* (Frankfurt, 1990).

S.Döpp, "Vergilrezeption in der ovidischen 'Aeneis'", *RhM* 134 (1991): 327-346.

S.Döpp, *Virgilischer Einfluß im Werk Ovids* (diss. München, 1968).

S.Döpp, *Werke Ovids. Eine Einführung* (München, 1992).

O.S.Due, *Changing Forms. Studies in the Metamorphoses of Ovid* (Copenhagen, 1974).

T.Eggers, *Die Darstellung von Naturgottheiten bei Ovid und früheren Dichtern* (Paderborn, 1984).

K.H.Eller, *Ovid und der Mythos von der Verwandlung* (Frankfurt, 1982).

P.Esposito, *La narrazione inverosimile. Aspetti dell'epica ovidiana* (Napoli, 1994).

J.Fabre-Serris, *Mythe et poésie dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide* (Paris, 1995).

C.Fantazzi, "Roman Ovid", in: *Filologia e forme letterarie. Studi offerti a F.Della Corte*, vol. 3 (Urbino, 1987): 173-187.

J.Farrell, "Dialogue of genres in Ovid's 'Lovesong of Polyphemus' (*Metamorphoses* 13. 719-897)", *AJPh* 113 (1992): 235-268.

H.Fränkel, *Ovid, a Poet between Two Worlds* (Berkeley, 1945, dt. 1970).

J.-M.Frécaut, *L'esprit et l'humour chez Ovide* (Grenoble, 1972).

J.-M.Frécaut, D.Porte (eds.), *Journées ovidiennes de Parménie. Actes du colloque sur Ovide* (Bruxelles, 1985).

G.K.Galinsky, *Ovid's Metamorphoses. An Introduction to the Basic Aspects* (Berkeley, 1975).

G.K.Galinsky, *Was Ovid a Silver Latin Poet?*, *ICS* 14 (1989): 69-88.

I.Gallo e L.Nicastri (edd.), *Cultura, poesia, ideologia nell'opera di Ovidio* (Napoli, 1991).

M.Giebel, *Ovid* (Reinbek, 1991).

H.-B.Guthmüller, *Beobachtungen zum Aufbau der Metamorphosen Ovids* (diss. Marburg, 1964).

H.Haege, *Terminologie und Typologie des Verwandlungsvorgangs in den Metamorphosen Ovids* (Göppingen, 1976).

R.Heinze, "Ovids elegische Erzählung", *SSAL* 71 (Leipzig, 1919); repr. in: R.Heinze, *Vom Geist des Römertums* (Darmstadt, 3rd ed. 1960): 308-403.

N.Herescu (ed.), *Ovidiana. Recherches sur Ovide* (Paris, 1958).

S.Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone. Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse* (Cambridge, 1987).

N.Holzberg, *Ovid. Dichter und Werk* (München, 1997).

P.E.Knox, *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry* (Cambridge, 1986).

W.Kraus, "Ovidius Naso", *RE* 18, 2 (1942): 1910-1986; rev. and augm. in: M.von Albrecht, E.Zinn (edd.), *Ovid* (Darmstadt, 1968): 67-166.

G.Lafaye, *Les Métamorphoses d'Ovide et leurs modèles grecs* (Paris, 1904; repr. 1971: introd. by M.von Albrecht).

J.Loehr, *Ovids Mehrfacherklärungen in der Tradition aitiologischen Dichtens* (Stuttgart, 1996).

W.Ludwig, *Struktur und Einheit der Metamorphosen Ovids* (Berlin, 1965).

S.Mack, *Ovid* (New Haven, 1988).

B.Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet* (Cambridge, 2nd ed. 1970).

G.Rosati, *Narciso e Pigmalione* (Firenze, 1983).

C.Santini, "Segni Grafici e Metamorfosi", in I. Gallo, P. Esposito (eds.), *Ovidio: da Roma all'Europa* (Napoli, 1988): 37-54.

E.A.Schmidt, *Ovids poetische Menschenwelt. Die Metamorphosen als Metapher und Symphonie* = *SHAW* (1991) 2.

U.Schmitzer, *Zeitgeschichte in Ovids Metamorphosen* (Stuttgart, 1990).

W.Schubert, *Die Mythologie in den nicht mythologischen Dichtungen Ovids* (Frankfurt, 1992).
W.Schubert (ed.), *Ovid. Werk und Wirkung*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt, 1998).
C.P.Segal, *Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses. A Study in the Transformations of a Literary Symbol* (Wiesbaden, 1969).
H.Skulsky, *Metamorphosis. The Mind in Exile* (Cambridge, Mass., 1981).
R.A.Smith, *Poetic allusion and Poetic embrace in Ovid and Virgil* (Ann Arbor, 1997).
J.Solodow, *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Chapel Hill, 1988).
L.Spahlinger, *Ars latet arte sua. Untersuchungen zur Poetologie in den Metamorphosen Ovids* (Stuttgart, 1996).
W.Stroh, *Ovid im Urteil der Nachwelt. Eine Testimoniensammlung* (Darmstadt, 1969).
R.Syme, *History in Ovid* (Oxford, 1978).
G.Tissol, *The Face of Nature. Wit, Narrative, and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Princeton, 1997).
U.Todini, *L'altro Omero. Scienza e storia nelle Metamorfosi di Ovidio* (Napoli, 1992).
C.Tomlinson, *Poetry and Metamorphosis* (Cambridge, 1982).
H.Tränkle, "Elegisches in Ovids *Metamorphosen*", *Hermes* 91 (1963): 459-476.
S.Viarre, *L'image et la pensée dans les Métamorphoses d'Ovide* (Paris, 1964).
S.Viarre, *Ovide. Essai de lecture poétique* (Paris, 1976).
L.P.Wilkinson, *Ovid Recalled* (Cambridge, 1955; repr. 1974).
L.P.Wilkinson, "Greek Influence on the Poetry of Ovid", in: *L'influence grecque sur la poésie latine, Entretiens* (Fondation Hardt) 2 (1956): 223-265.

Albinovanus Pedo

Editions: *FPL* 115-116 Morel; 147-148 Büchner; 290-292 Blänsdorf; *FLP* 320-328 Courtney.

H.Bardon, *La littérature latine inconnue*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1952 and 1956), vol 2: 69-73.
H.W.Benario, "The Text of Albinovanus Pedo", *Latomus* 32 (1973): 166-169.
V.Bongi, "Nuova esegesi del frammento di Albinovano Pedone", *RIL* 82 (1949): 28-48.
A.Cozzolino, "Due precedenti lucanei", *Vichiana* 5 (1976): 54-61.
H.Dahlmann, see: "Cornelius Severus".
D.Detlefsen, "Zur Kenntnis der Alten von der Nordsee", *Hermes* 32 (1897): 190-201, esp. 196-201.
L.Duret, "Dans l'ombre des plus grands: I. Poètes et prosateurs mal connus de l'époque augustéenne", *ANRW* 2, 30, 3 (1983): 1447-1560, esp. 1496-1501.
E.Pianezzola, "Au-delà des frontières du monde. Un topos rhétorique pour un rétablissement du texte d'Albinovanus Pedo (p. 116 Morel = 148 Büchner, v. 19)", *REL* 62 (1984): 192-205.
V.Tandoi, "Albinovano Pedone e la retorica Giulio-Claudia delle conquiste", *SIFC* 36 (1964): 129-168; 39 (1967): 5-66.

Cornelius Severus

Editions: *FPL* 116-119 Morel; 148-152 Büchner; 292-299 Blänsdorf; *FLP* 320-328 Courtney.

H.Bardon, *La littérature latine inconnue*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1952 and 1956), vol 2: 61-64.
E.Bolisani, "Intorno a Cornelio Severo", *AAPad* (1934-1935): 293-314.

A.Cozzolino, "Due precedenti lucanei", *Vichiana* 5 (1976): 54-61.
H.Dahlmann, "Cornelius Severus", *AAWM* (1975) 6: 1-156.
L.Duret, "Dans l'ombre des plus grands: I. Poètes et prosateurs mal connus de l'époque augustéenne", *ANRW* 2, 30, 3 (1983): 1447-1560, esp. 1492-1496.
P.Grenade, "Le mythe de Pompée et les Pompéiens sous les Césars", *REA* 52 (1950): 28-63.
H.Homeyer, "Klage um Cicero. Zu dem epischen Fragment des Cornelius Severus", *AUS* 10 (1961): 327-334.
H.Homeyer, "Ciceros Tod im Urteil der Nachwelt", *Altertum* 17 (1971): 165-174, esp. 169-170.
F.Skutsch, "Cornelius Severus", *RE* 4, 1 (1900): 1509-1510.

Lucan

Editions: C.F.Weber (TC, with the scholiasts), 3 vols. (Lipsiae, 1821-1831). C.E.Haskins (TC) (London, 1887). C.M.Francken (TC) (Lugduni Batavorum, 1896-1897). C.Hosius (Lipsiae, 3rd ed. 1913). A.E.Housman (editorum in usum) (Oxford, 2nd ed. 1927). J.D.Duff (TTr) (London, 1928). W.Ehlers (TTr) (München, 2nd ed. 1978). G.Luck (TTr) (Berlin, 1985). D.R.Shackleton Bailey (Stutgardiae, 1988). R.Badalì (TTrN) (Torino, 1988). R.Badalì (T) (Roma, 1992). S.H.Braund (TrN) (Oxford, 1992).

Book 1: R.J.Getty (TC) (Cambridge, 2nd ed. 1955). P.Wuilleumier, H.LeBonniec (TC) (Paris, 1962). *Book 2*: E.Fantham (TC) (Cambridge, 1992). *Book 3*: V.Hunink (C) (Amsterdam, 1992). *Book 6, 118-260*: G.B.Conte (TC) (1988; see below): 43-112. *Book 7*: O.A.W.Dilke (TC) (Cambridge, 1960). *Book 8*: J.P.Postgate (TC) (Cambridge, 1917). R.Mayer (TTrC) (Warminster, 1981). *Book 10. 1-171*: M.G.Schmidt (C) (1986; see below).

Ancient Vitae: C.Braidotti (Bologna, 1972).

Scholia: *Commenta Bernensia*, ed. H.Usener (Lipsiae, 1869). *Adnotationes super Lucanum*, ed. J.Endt (Lipsiae, 1909). *Supplementum adnotationum super Lucanum I* (libri I-V), ed. G.A.Cavajoni (Milano, 1979); *II* (libri VI-VII) (1984). *Arnulfi Aurelianensis glosule super Lucanum*, ed. B.M.Marti (Roma, 1958).

Index: G.W.Mooney, *Hermathena* 44. 1 (Dublin, 1927).

Concordances: R.J.Deferrari, M.W.Fanning, and A.S.Sullivan (Washington, 1940). M.Wacht (Hildesheim, 1992).

Bibl.: W.Rutz, *Lustrum* 9 (1964): 243-340; 10 (1965): 246-259; 26 (1984): 105-203; 27 (1985): 149-166. W.Rutz, "Lucans *Pharsalia* im Lichte der neuesten Forschung" (with bibl. add. 1980-1985 by H.Tuitje), *ANRW* 2, 32, 3 (1985): 1457-1537. Andreas W.Schmitt, in: Rutz 1989 (see below).

F.M.Ahl, *Lucan. An Introduction* (Ithaca/London, 1976).
F.Arnaldi, "Lucano", *Vichiana* n.s. 3 (1974): 40-49.
J.Aymard, *Quelques séries de comparaisons chez Lucain* (Montpellier, 1951).
J.Béranger, "Idéologie impériale et épopée latine", in: *Mélanges J.Carcopino* (Paris, 1966): 97-112.
H.Berthold, "Beobachtungen zu den Epilogen Lucans", *Helikon* 17 (1977): 218-225.
W.Blissett, "Caesar and Satan", *JHI* 18 (1957): 221-232.

J.Brisset, *Les idées politiques de Lucain* (Paris, 1964).
E.Burck and W.Rutz, "Die *Pharsalia* Lucans", in: E.Burck (ed.), *Das römische Epos* (Darmstadt, 1979): 154-199.
G.B.Conte, *La Guerra Civile di Lucano. Studi e prove di Commento* (Urbino, 1988).
M.Dewar, "Laying it on With a Trowel: the Proem to Lucan and Related Texts", *CQ* n.s. 44 (1994): 199-211.
O.S.Due, "An Essay on Lucan", *C&M* 23 (1962): 68-132.
P.Esposito, "Lucano e Ovidio", in: I.Gallo, L.Nicastri (edd.), *Aetates Ovidianae. Lettori di Ovidio dall'antichità al rinascimento* (Napoli, 1995): 57-76.
E.Fraenkel, "Lucan als Mittler des antiken Pathos", in: *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg* 4, 1924-25 (Leipzig, 1927): 229-257, repr. in: W.Rutz (ed.), *Lucan*, see below: 15-49.
D.B.George, "The Meaning of the *Pharsalia* Revisited", in: C.Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* (Bruxelles, 1992): 362-369.
R.Glaesser, *Verbrechen und Verblendung. Untersuchungen zum Furor-Begriff bei Lucan mit Berücksichtigung der Tragödien Senecas* (Frankfurt, 1984).
P.Grimal, "Lucain et Sénèque à propos d'une tempête", in: *Mélanges E.Gareau* (Ottawa, 1982): 173-178.
F.Gundolf, *Caesar. Geschichte seines Ruhms* (Berlin, 1924): esp. 32-36.
L.Håkanson, "Problems of Textual Criticism and Interpretation in Lucan's *De bello civili*", *PCPhS* 25 (1979): 26-51.
R.Häussler, *Das historische Epos von Lucan bis Silius und seine Theorie. Studien zum historischen Epos der Antike 2. Geschichtliche Epik nach Vergil* (Heidelberg, 1978).
M.Helzle, "*Indocilis privata loqui.* The Characterization of Lucan's Caesar", *SO* 69 (1994): 121-136.
J.Henderson, "Lucan: The Word at War", in: *The Imperial Muse: To Juvenal through Ovid*, ed. by A.J.Boyle (Bendigo, 1988): 122-164.
U.Hübner, "Episches und Elegisches am Anfang des dritten Buches der *Pharsalia*", *Hermes* 112 (1984): 227-239.
V.Hunink, "Lucan's Praise of Nero", in: F.Cairns and M. Heath (eds.), *Roman Poetry and Prose, Greek Rhetoric and Poetry* (Leeds 1993): 135-140.
W.R.Johnson, *Momentary Monsters: Lucan and His Heroes* (Ithaca, 1987).
M.Lapidge, "Lucan's Imagery of Cosmic Dissolution", *Hermes* 107 (1979): 344-370.
W.D.Lebek, *Lucans Pharsalia. Dichtungsstruktur und Zeitbezug* (Göttingen, 1976).
M.Leigh, *Lucan. Spectacle and Engagement* (Oxford, 1997).
H.-W.Linn, *Studien zur aemulatio des Lucan* (diss. Hamburg, 1971).
A.Loupiac, "La poétique des éléments dans la *Pharsale*", *BAGB* 1991, 3: 247-266.
Lucain. Sept exposés suivis de discussions par B.Marti, P.Grimal, F.L.Bastet, H.Le Bonniec, O.Steen Due, W.Rutz, M.von Albrecht (= *Entretiens* Fondation Hardt 15, Vandœuvres-Genève, 1968).
B.M.Marti, "Lucan's Narrative Techniques", *Latomus* 30 (1975): 74-90.
C.Martindale, "Paradox, Hyperbole, and Literary Novelty in Lucan's *De bello civili*", *BICS* 23 (1976): 45-54.
J.Masters, *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum civile* (Cambridge, 1992).
Y.Miura, "Zur Funktion der Gleichnisse im I. und VII. Buch von Lucans *Pharsalia*", *GB* 10 (1981): 207-232.
M.P.O.Morford, *The Poet Lucan. Studies in Rhetorical Epic* (Oxford, 1967).
E.Narducci, *La provvidenza crudele: Lucano e la distruzione dei miti augustei* (Pisa, 1979).
E.Narducci, "Ideologia e tecnica allusiva nella *Pharsalia*", *ANRW* 2, 32, 3 (1985): 1538-1564.
A.Ollfors, *Studien zum Aufbau des Hexameters Lucans* (Göteborg, 1967).
A.Ollfors, *Textkritische und interpretatorische Beiträge zu Lucan* (ibid. 1967).
U.Piacentini, *Osservazioni sulla tecnica epica di Lucano* (Berlin, 1963).
R.Pichon, *Les sources de Lucain* (Paris, 1912).

W.Rutz, *Studien zur Kompositionskunst und zur epischen Technik Lucans* (unpubl. diss. Kiel, 1950), new ed., corr. and with a bibl. epilogue by Andreas W.Schmitt (Frankfurt, 1989).

W.Rutz (ed.), *Lucan* (Darmstadt, 1970).

Manfred Gerhard Schmidt, *Caesar und Cleopatra. Philologischer und historischer Kommentar zu Lucan 10. 1-171* (Frankfurt, 1986).

Andreas W.Schmitt, *Die direkten Reden der Massen in Lucans Pharsalia* (Frankfurt, 1995).

O.Schönberger, *Untersuchungen zur Wiederholungstechnik Lucans* (München 2nd ed., 1968).

H.P.Syndikus, *Lucans Gedicht vom Bürgerkrieg* (diss. München, 1958).

L.Thompson, R.T.Bruère, "Lucan's Use of Vergilian Reminiscence", *CPh* 63 (1968): 1-21.

H.J.Tschiedel, "Lucan und die Tränen Caesars", *Eichstätter Hochschulreden* 46 (1985): 3-26.

Valerius Flaccus

Editions: P.Langen (TC), 2 vols. (Berlin 1896-1897, repr. 1964). J.H.Mozley (TTr) (Cambridge, Mass., 1934, repr. 1963). E.Courtney (Lipsiae, 1970).W.-W.Ehlers (Stutgardiae, 1980). H.Rupprecht (TTr) (Mitterfels, 1987). *Book 2*: H.M.Poortvliet (C) (Amsterdam, 1991). *Book 4. 1-343*: M.Korn (C) (Hildesheim, 1989). *Book 7*: H.Stadler (C) (Hildesheim, 1993). A.Perutelli (TC) (Firenze, 1997).

Indices: W.H.Schulte, *Index verborum Valerianus* (diss. Columbia College, Dubuque, Iowa 1931, Scottdale, 1935, repr. 1965). M.Wacht, *Lemmatischer Index zu Valerius Flaccus mit statistischen Anhängen zu Sprache und Metrik* (Regensburg, 1982).

Concordance: M.Korn, W.A.Slaby, *Concordantia in Valerii Flacci Argonautica* (Hildesheim, 1988).

Bibl.: W.-W.Ehlers, "Valerius Flaccus 1940-1971", *Lustrum* 16 (1971-1972): 105-142; 306-308. M.Scaffai, "Rassegna di studi su Valerio Flacco (1938-1982)", *ANRW* 2. 32. 4 (1986): 2359-2447.

J.Adamietz, *Zur Komposition der Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus* (München, 1976).

W.R.Barnes, "The Trojan War in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*", *Hermes* 109 (1981): 360-370.

M.Billerbeck, "Stoizismus in der römischen Epik neronischer und flavischer Zeit", *ANRW* 2, 32, 5 (1986): 3116-3151.

E.Burck, "Die *Argonautica* des Valerius Flaccus", in: E.Burck (ed.), *Das römische Epos* (Darmstadt, 1979): 208-253.

E.Burck, "Die Befreiung der Andromeda bei Ovid und der Hesione bei Valerius Flaccus (*Met.* 4. 663-764; *Argon.* 2. 451-578)", *WS* 89 (1976): 221-238.

S.A.Cecchin, "Intreccio e tempo narrativo nelle Argonautiche di Valerio Flacco", *CCC* 1 (1980): 349-370.

S.Contino, *Lingua e stile in Valerio Flacco* (Bologna, 1973).

P.Dräger, *Argo pasimelousa. Der Argonautenmythos in der griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart, 1993).

D.C.Feeney, *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* (Oxford, 1991): 313-337.

J.G.Fitch, "Aspects of Valerius Flaccus' Use of Similes", *TAPhA* 106 (1976): 113-124.

R.W.Garson, "Valerius Flaccus the Poet", *CQ* 20 (1970): 181-187.

U.Gärtner, *Gehalt und Funktion der Gleichnisse bei Valerius Flaccus* (Stuttgart, 1994).

U.Gärtner, "Träume bei Valerius Flaccus", *Philologus* 140 (1996): 292-305.

K.W.D.Hull, "The Hero-Concept in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*", in: C.Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. 1 (Bruxelles, 1979): 379-409.

H.Juhnke, see above, "General".

A.J.Kleywegt, "Die Dichtersprache des Valerius Flaccus", *ANRW* 2, 32, 4 (1986): 2448-2490.

M.Korn, H.J.Tschiedel (eds.), *Ratis omnia vincet. Untersuchungen zu den Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus* (Hildesheim, 1991).

H.-O.Kröner, "Zu den künstlerischen Absichten des Valerius Flaccus", *Hermes* 96 (1968): 733-754.

A.La Penna, "Tipi e modelli femminili nella poesia dell'epoca dei Flavi", in: *Atti del Congresso di Studi Vespasianei* (Rieti, 1979): 223-251.

E.Lefèvre, "Das Prooemium der *Argonautica* des Valerius Flaccus. Ein Beitrag zur Typik epischer Prooemien der römischen Kaiserzeit", *AAWM* (1971): 6.

B.E.Lewis, "Valerius Flaccus' portrait of Jason: evidence from the similes", *AClass (Pretoria)* 27 (1984): 91-100.

E.Lüthje, *Gehalt und Aufriß der Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus* (diss. Kiel, 1972).

M.A.Malamud, D.T.McGuire, jr., "Flavian Variant: Myth. Valerius' *Argonautica*", in: A.J.Boyle (ed.), *Roman Epic* (London, New York, 1993): 192-217.

F.Mehmel, *Valerius Flaccus* (diss. Hamburg, 1934).

O.Pederzani, "*Curiositas* e classicismo nelle *Argonautiche* di Valerio Flacco", *MD* 18 (1987): 101-129.

J.B.Perkins, "An Aspect of the Style of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonauticon*", *Phoenix* 28 (1974): 290-313.

A.Perutelli, "Pluralità di modelli e discontinuità narrativa. L'episodio della morte di Esone in Valerio Flacco (1. 747 sgg.)", *MD* 7 (1982): 123-140.

P.Schenk, *Die Zurücklassung des Herakles. Ein Beispiel der epischen Kunst des Valerius Flaccus (Arg. 3. 598-725)*, = *AAWM* 1986, 1.

W.Schetter, "Die Buchzahl der *Argonautica* des Valerius Flaccus", *Philologus* 103 (1959): 297-308.

W.Schubert, *Jupiter in den Epen der Flavierzeit* (Frankfurt, 1984).

W.Schubert, "Socia Juno. Zur Gestalt der Götterkönigin in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*", in: M.Korn and H.J.Tschiedel (eds.), *Ratis omnia uincet. Untersuchungen zu den Argonautica des V. Flaccus* (Hildesheim, 1991 = *Spudasmata* 48): 121-137.

J.Stroux, "Valerius Flaccus und Horaz", *Philologus* 90 (1935): 305-330.

R.Syme, "The *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus", *CQ* 23 (1929): 129-137.

P.R.Taylor, "Valerius' Flavian Argonautica", *CQ* n.s. 44 (1994): 212-235.

A.Traglia, "Valerio Flacco, Apollonio Rodio e Virgilio. Gli episodi di Hylas e di Giasone e Medea", *Vichiana* 12 (1983): 304-325.

V.Ussani jr., *Studio su Valerio Flacco* (Roma, 1955).

P.Venini, "Valerio Flacco e l'erudizione Apolloniana: note stilistiche", *RIL* 105 (1971): 582-596.

P.Venini, "Sulla struttura delle *Argonautiche* di Valerio Flacco", ibid. 597-620.

P.Venini, "Su alcuni motivi delle *Argonautiche* di Valerio Flacco", *BStudLat* 2 (1972): 10-19.

D.W.T.Vessey, "Lemnos Revisited. Some Aspects of Valerius Flaccus", *Argonautica*, 2: 77-305, *CJ* 80 (1985): 326-339.

M.Wacht, *Juppiters Weltenplan im Epos des Valerius Flaccus* (Stuttgart, 1991).

Silius Italicus

Editions: G.A.Ruperti (TC), 2 vols. (Gottingae 1795-1798). L.Bauer, 2 vols. (Lipsiae 1890-1892). J.D.Duff (TTr), 2 vols. (London, 1934). F.Spaltenstein (C), 2 vols. (Genève, 1986 and 1990). J.Delz (Stutgardiae, 1987) (authoritative). H.Rupprecht (TTr), 2 vols. (Mitterfels, 1991). *Book 6*: U.Fröhlich (C) (diss. Heidelberg, 1998).

Indices: M.Wacht, *Lemmatisierter Index zu Silius Italicus, Punica, mit statistischen Anhängen zu Sprache und Metrik* (Regensburg, 1984). N.D.Young, *Index verborum Silianus* (Iowa City, 1939, repr. 1964).

Bibl.: R.Helm, "Forschungsbericht über nachaugusteische nichtchristliche Dichter", *Lustrum* 1 (1957): esp. 255-272. M.von Albrecht (1964): 215-237; see also the new editions and F.Ahl.

F.Ahl, M.A.Davis, A.Pomeroy, "Silius Italicus", *ANRW* 2. 32. 4 (1986): 2492-2561.
M.von Albrecht, *Silius Italicus. Freiheit und Gebundenheit römischer Epik* (Amsterdam, 1964).
M.Bettini, "Ennio in Silio Italico", *RFIC* 105 (1977): 425-447.
M.Billerbeck, "Stoizismus in der römischen Epik neronischer und flavischer Zeit", *ANRW* 2. 32. 5 (1986): 3116-3151.
S.Borzsák, "Die *Punica* des Silius Italicus und die Alexander-Überlieferung", in: G.Wirth (ed.), *Romanitas–Christianitas, FS J.Straub* (Berlin, 1982): 164-174.
L.Braun, "Der Aufbau der *Punica* des Silius Italicus", *WJA* n.s. 19 (1993): 173-183.
E.Burck, "Die *Punica* des Silius Italicus", in: E.Burck (ed.), *Das römische Epos* (Darmstadt, 1979): 254-299.
E.Burck, *Historische und epische Tradition bei Silius Italicus* (München, 1984).
J.Dingel, "Corythus bei Vergil und Silius Italicus", *Philologus* 139 (1995): 89-96.
M.Fucecchi, "Lo spettacolo delle virtù nel giovane eroe predestinato: Analisi della figura di Scipione in Silio Italico", *Maia n.s.* 45 (1993):17-48.
R.Häussler, *Studien zum historischen Epos der Antike, II: Das historische Epos von Lucan bis Silius und seine Theorie* (Heidelberg, 1978).
M.Helzle, "Die Redeweise der Hauptpersonen in Silius Italicus' *Punica*", *CM* 46 (1995): 189-213.
H.Juhnke, *Homerisches in römischer Epik flavischer Zeit. Untersuchungen zu Szenennachbildungen und Strukturentsprechungen in Statius' Thebais und in Silius' Punica* (München, 1972).
W.Kißel, *Das Geschichtsbild des Silius Italicus* (Frankfurt, 1979).
A.Klotz, "Silius Italicus", *RE* 2. 5 (1927): 79-91.
J.Küppers, *Tantarum causas irarum. Untersuchungen zur einleitenden Bücherdyade der Punica des Silius Italicus* (Berlin, 1986).
G.Laudizi, *Silio Italico. Il passato tra mito e restaurazione etica* (Galatina, 1989).
G.Lorenz, *Vergleichende Interpretationen zu Silius Italicus und Statius* (diss. Kiel, 1968).
K.O.Matier, "The Poetic Sources of Silius Italicus with Particular Reference to Book Eleven", *AClass* 26 (1983): 73-82.
K.O.Matier, "The Similes of Silius Italicus", *LCM* 11 (1986): 152-155.
K.O.Matier, "The Influence of Ennius on Silius Italicus", *Akroterion* 36 (1991): 153-158.
P.McGushin, *The Transmission of the Punica of Silius Italicus* (Amsterdam, 1985).
V.Neri, "Dei, Fato e divinazione nella letteratura Latina del I sec. d. C.", *ANRW* 2, 16, 3 (1986): 1974-2051, esp. 2026-2046.
H.G.Nesselrath, "Zu den Quellen des Silius Italicus", *Hermes* 114 (1986): 203-230.
J.Nicol, *The Historical and Geographical Sources Used by Silius Italicus* (Oxford, 1936).

K.-H.Niemann, *Die Darstellung der römischen Niederlagen in den Punica des Silius Italicus* (diss. Bonn, 1975).
C.Reitz, *Die Nekyia in den Punica des Silius Italicus* (Frankfurt, 1982).
C.Santini, *Silius Italicus and his View of the Past* (Amsterdam, 1991).
A.-M.Tupet, "Le serment d'Hannibal chez Silius Italicus", *BAGB* (1980) 2: 186-193.
D.Vessey, "Silius Italicus on the Fall of Saguntum", *CPh* 69 (1974): 28-36.
W.S.Watt, "Siliana", *MH* 45 (1988): 170-181.
E.Wistrand, *Die Chronologie der Punica des Silius Italicus* (Göteborg, 1956).

Statius

Editions: *Complete editions*: A.Traglia, G.Aricò (TTrN) (Torino, 1980). J.H.Mozley (TTr), 2 vols. (London, 1928). C.H.Moore (Tr) (Boston, 1933). *Theb.* and *Ach.*: H.W.Garrod (Oxford, 1906). *Theb.*: A.Imhof (Tr) (Leipzig 1885-1889). A.Klotz (Lipsiae, 1908), ed. corr. T.C.Klinnert (Leipzig, 1973). D.E.Hill (Lugduni Batavorum, 1983). A.D.Melville, D.W.T.Vessey (TrN) (Oxford, 1992). R.Lesueur (TTr), 3 vols. (Paris, 1990-1994). *Theb. 1*: H.Heuvel (TTrC) (Groningen, 1932). F.Caviglia (TTrC) (Roma, 1973). *Theb. 2*: H.M.Mulder (TC) (Groningen, 1954). *Theb. 3*: H.Snijder (TC) (Amsterdam, 1968). *Theb. 6*: H.W.Fortgens (TTrC) (Zutphen, 1934). *Theb. 7*: J.J.L.Smolenaars (C) (Leiden, 1994). *Theb. 9*: M.Dewar (TTrC) (Oxford, 1991). *Theb. 10*: R.D.Williams (TC) (Leiden, 1972). *Theb. 11*: P.Venini (TTrC) (Firenze, 1970). *Ach.*: A.Klotz (Lipsiae, 1902). O.A.W.Dilke (TC) (Cambridge, 1954). J.Méheust (TTr) (Paris, 1971).

Lactantii Placidi in Statii Thebaida commentarii libri XII, ed. R.D.Sweeney (Stuttgart, 1994).

Concordances: R.J.Deferrari and M.C.Eagan (Brookland, D.C., 1943). J.Klecka (Hildesheim, 1983).

Bibl.: on the *Thebaid* see below: F.M.Ahl (1986). G.Aricò, "Interpretazioni recenti della composizione della *Tebaide*", *ALGP* 5-6 n.s. (1968-1969): 216-233. On the *Achilleid*: G.Aricò (1986).

F.M.Ahl, "Statius' *Thebaid*. A Reconsideration", *ANRW* 2. 32. 5 (1986): 2803-2912.
G.Aricò, *Ricerche Staziane* (Palermo, 1972).
G.Aricò, "L'*Achilleide* di Stazio. Tradizione letteraria e invenzione narrativa", *ANRW* 2. 32. 5 (1986): 2925-2964.
P.Carrara, "Stazio e i *primordia* di Tebe. Poetica e polemica nel prologo della *Tebaide*", *Prometheus* 12 (1986): 146-158.
P.M.Clogan, *The Medieval Achilleid of Statius* (Leiden, 1968).
R.Corti, "Due funzioni della similitudine nella *Tebaide* di Stazio", *Maia* n.s. 39 (1987): 3-23.
W.J.Dominik, *Speech and Rhetoric in Statius' Thebaid* (Hildesheim, 1994).
W.J.Dominik, *The Mythic Voice of Statius. Power and Politics in the Thebaid* (Leiden, 1994).
E.Fantham, "'Envy and Fear the Begetter of Hate?' Statius' *Thebaid* and the Genesis of Hatred", in: S.Morton Braund, C.Gill (edd.), *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature* (Cambridge, 1997): 185-212.
I.Frings, *Odia fraterna als manieristisches Motiv–Betrachtungen zu Senecas Thyest und Statius' Thebais* (Stuttgart, 1992).

L.Håkanson, *Statius' Thebaid. Critical and Exegetical Remarks* (Lund, 1973).
S.J.Harrison, "The Arms of Capaneus: Statius, *Thebaid* 4. 165-177", *CQ* n.s. 42 (1992): 247-252.
J.Henderson, "Statius' *Thebaid*: Form Premade", *PCPhS* 37 (1991): 30-80.
D.Hershkowitz, "Patterns of Madness in Statius' *Thebaid*", *JRS* 85 (1995): 52-64.
H.Juhnke, *Homerisches in römischer Epik flavischer Zeit. Untersuchungen zu Szenennachbildungen und Strukturentsprechungen in Statius' Thebais und Achilleis und in Silius' Punica* (München, 1972).
E.Kabsch, *Funktion und Stellung des zwölften Buches der Thebais des P.Papinius Statius* (diss. Kiel, 1968).
T.C.Klinnert, *Capaneus–Hippomedon. Interpretationen zur Heldendarstellung in der Thebais des P.Papinius Statius* (diss. Heidelberg, 1970).
B.Kytzler, "*Imitatio* und *aemulatio* in der *Thebais* des Statius", *Hermes* 97 (1969): 209-232.
B.Kytzler, "Zum Aufbau der statianischen *Thebais*. Pius Coroebus, *Theb.* 1. 557-692", *ANRW* 2, 32, 5 (1986): 2913-2924.
B.Kytzler, "Pandere Thebas. Welches Thema hat die *Thebais*?", in: *Epicedion. Hommage à P.Papinius Statius 96-1996* (Poitiers, 1996): 25-34.
L.Legras, *Étude sur la Thebaïde de Stace* (Paris, 1905).
R.Lesueur, "Les personnages féminins dans la Thébaïde de Stace", *BSTEC* 189-190 (1986): 19-32.
G.Lorenz, *Vergleichende Interpretationen zu Silius Italicus und Statius* (diss. Kiel, 1968).
H.-A.Luipold, *Die Bruder-Gleichnisse in der Thebais des Statius* (diss. Tübingen, 1970).
S.von Moisy, *Untersuchungen zur Erzählweise in Statius' Thebais* (diss. Bonn, 1971).
S.G.Nugent, "Statius' Hypsipyle: Following in the Footsteps of the *Aeneid*", *Scholia* 5 (1996): 46-71.
Z.Pavlovskis, "The Education of Achilles as Treated in the Literature of Late Antiquity", *PP* 20 (1965): 281-297.
G.Rosati, "Momenti e forme della fortuna antica di Ovidio: l'*Achilleide* di Stazio", in: M.Picone, B.Zimmermann (eds.), *Ovidius redivivus. Von Ovid zu Dante* (Stuttgart, 1994): 43-62.
W.Schetter, *Untersuchungen zur epischen Kunst des Statius* (Wiesbaden, 1960).
R.B.Steele, "Interrelation of the Latin Poets under Domitian", *CPh* 2 (1930): 328-342.
G.von Stosch, *Untersuchungen zu den Leichenspielen in der Thebais des P.Papinius Statius* (diss. Tübingen, 1968).
R.C.Tanner, "Epic Tradition and Epigram in Statius", *ANRW* 2, 32, 5 (1986): 3020-3046.
P.Venini, *Studi staziani* (Pavia, 1971).
D.W.T.Vessey, *Statius and the Thebaid* (Cambridge, 1973).
D.W.T.Vessey, "*Pierius menti calor incidit.* Statius' Epic Style", *ANRW* 2, 32, 5 (1986): 2965-3019.

Claudian

Editions: N.Heinsius (Lugduni Batavorum, 1650; Amstelodami, 1665). T.Birt (critical, with an extensive introduction and index) (Berolini, 1892; repr. 1961 = *MGH AA* 10). M.Platnauer (TTr) (London, 1922). J.B.Hall (Leipzig, 1985). *Rapt.*: J.B.Hall (TC) (Cambridge, 1969). J.-L.Charlet (TTr) (Paris, 1991). C.Gruzelier (TTrC) (Oxford, 1993). *Rapt. 1.*: E.Potz (C) (diss. Graz, 1985).

Indices: M.Wacht, *Lemmatisierter Index zu den Carmina maiora Claudians mit statistischen Anhängen zu Sprache und Metrik* (Nürnberg, 1980 = *Regensburger Microfiche Materialien* 9).

Bibl.: F.Casaceli, "Recenti studi Claudianei", *BStudLat* 2 (1972): 318-326. See also the monographs and commentaries.

M.Balzert, *Die Komposition des Claudianischen Gotenkriegsgedichtes c. 26* (Hildesheim, 1974).
A.Cameron, *Claudian. Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (Oxford, 1970).
A.Cameron, "Claudian", in: J.W.Binns (ed.), *Latin Literature of the Fourth Century* (London, 1974): 134-159.
P.G.Christiansen, *The Use of Images by Claudius Claudianus* (Den Haag, 1969).
S.Döpp, *Zeitgeschichte in Dichtungen Claudians* (Wiesbaden, 1980).
A.H.Eaton, *The Influence of Ovid on Claudian* (diss. Washington, 1943).
W.Ernest, *Die Laudes Honorii Claudians: 3 Beispiele poetischer Konsulatspanegyrik im Vergleich* (diss. Regensburg, 1987).
P.Fargues, *Claudien. Etudes sur sa poésie et son temps* (Paris, 1933).
W.Fauth, "Concussio Terrae. Das Thema der seismischen Erschütterung und der vulkanischen Eruption in Claudians *De raptu Proserpinae*", *A&A* 34 (1988): 63-78.
A.Fo, *Studi sulla tecnica poetica di Claudiano* (Catania, 1982).
H.Funke, "The Universe of Claudian. Its Greek Sources", *PLLS* 5 (1985; publ. 1986): 357-366.
S.Gennaro, "Lucrezio e l'apologetica latina in Claudiano", *MSLC* 7 (1957): 5-60.
I.Gualandri, *Aspetti della tecnica compositiva in Claudiano* (Milano, 1968).
J.B.Hall, *Prolegomena to Claudian* (London, 1986 = *BICS* suppl. 45).
T.Kellner, *Die Göttergestalten in Claudians De raptu Proserpinae. Polarität und Koinzidenz als anthropozentrische Dialektik mythologisch formulierter Weltvergewisserung* (Stuttgart, 1997).
U.Keudel, *Poetische Vorläufer und Vorbilder in Claudians De consulatu Stilichonis* (Göttingen, 1970).
S.Koster, *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Meisenheim, 1980).
B.Lawatsch-Boomgaarden, "Die Kunstbeschreibung als strukturierendes Stilmittel in den Panegyriken des Claudius Claudianus", *GB* 18 (1992): 171-193.
H.L.Levy, "Themes of Encomium and Invective in Claudian", *TAPhA* 89 (1958): 336-347.
J.Long, *Claudian's In Eutropium or, How, When, and Why to Slander a Eunuch* (London, 1996).
R.Moes, *Les hellénismes de l'epoque théodosienne. Recherches sur le vocabulaire d'origine grecque chez Ammien, Claudien et dans l'Histoire Auguste* (Strasbourg, 1980).
R.Perrelli, *I proemi claudianei. Tra epica è didattica* (Catania, 1992).
M.L.Ricci, "Il mito della Fenice in Claudiano tra propaganda politica e scienza", *Quaderni dell'A.I.C.C. di Foggia* (1981): 63-71.
Z.Ritoók, "Über Claudians *De raptu Proserpinae*", *Acta Ant. Hung.* 35 (1994): 134-158.
Wolfgang Schmid, "Claudianus", *RLAC* 3 (1957): 152-167.
P.L.Schmidt, *Politik und Dichtung in der Panegyrik Claudians* (Konstanz, 1976).
F.Vollmer, "Claudianus", *RE* 3. 2 (1899): 2652-2660.
S.M.Wheeler, "The Underworld Opening of Claudian's *De raptu Proserpinae*", *TAPhA* 125 (1995): 113-134.

Corippus

Editions: M.Petschenig (T) (Berlin, 1886 = *Berliner Studien für classische Philologie und Archaeologie* 4, 2). *Iohannis*: I.Diggle and F.R.D.Goodyear (T) (Cambridge, 1970). *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris*: D.Romano (T) (Palermo, 1970). U.J.Stache (C; bibl.) (Berlin, 1976). A.Cameron (TTrC) (London, 1976). S.Antès (TTr) (Paris, 1981).

Concordance: *Concordantia in Flavii Corippi Ioannida. Curavit* J.U.Andres (Hildesheim, 1993), cf., however, R.Jakobi, *Gnomon* 70 (1998): 361-362.

Bibl.: see below, E.Burck.

R.Amann, *De Corippo priorum poetarum imitatore* (diss. Kiel = Progr. Oldenburg I 1885; II 1888).
B.Baldwin, "Corippus and Ennius", *ICS* 13 (1988): 175-182.
J.Blänsdorf, "*Aeneadas rursus cupiunt resonare Camenae.* Vergils epische Form in der *Johannis* des Corippus", in: E.Lefèvre (ed.), *Monumentum Chiloniense. Studien zur augusteischen Zeit. Kieler Festschrift für E.Burck* (Amsterdam, 1975): 524-545.
E.Burck, in: E.Burck (ed.), *Das römische Epos* (Darmstadt, 1979): 379-399; 418-419 (bibl.).
A. and A.Cameron, "Textual notes on Corippus, *In Laudem Iustini minoris*", *Latomus* 35 (1976): 404-415.
A.Cameron, "The career of Corippus again", *CQ* 74 (1980): 534-539.
I.Cazzaniga, "Del nuovo Ennio nella *Ioannide* di Corippo?", *RFIC* 99 (1971): 276-287.
J.Diggle, "Notes on the *Iohannis* of Corippus", *CQ* 62 (1968): 132-141.
W.Ehlers, "Epische Kunst in Coripps *Johannis*", *Philologus* 124 (1980): 109-135.
Å.Fridh, "*Funera dare* in Epic Latin Poetry. A Note on Corippus, *Ioh.* 2. 108", *Eranos* 73 (1975): 112-115.
H.Hofmann, "Cornelius van Arckel und sein Coripp-Kommentar", *Philologus* 134 (1990): 111-138.
R.Jakobi, "Kritisches und Exegetisches zur *Iohannis* des Coripp", *Hermes* 117 (1989): 95-119.
W.Kirsch, "Strukturwandel im lateinischen Epos des 4. bis 6. Jh.", *Philologus* 123 (1979): 38-53.
M.Lausberg, "*Parcere subiectis.* Zur Vergilnachfolge in der *Johannis* des Coripp", *JbAC* 32 (1989): 105-126.
J.Mantke, "Das Bild der Barbaren in der *Johannis* des Corippus", *Philologus* 140 (1996): 329-333.
D.Schaller, "Die frühkarolingische Corippus-Rezeption", *WS* 105 (1992): 173-187.
D.R.Shackleton Bailey, "Notes on Corippus, *Laudes Iustini*", in: *Festschrift Franco Munari* (1986): 315-319.
P.Speck, "Marginalien zu dem Gedicht *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris* des Corippus", *Philologus* 134 (1990): 82-92.
M.A.Vinchiesi, "Versi nuovi di Corippo in imitazioni inedite dell'umanista Giovanni de Bonis", *RFIC* 108 (1980): 292-316.
V.Zarini, *Berbères ou barbares? Recherches sur le livre second de la "Johannide" de Corippe* (Nancy, 1997).

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS: PERIODICALS AND STANDARD WORKS

Abbreviations Used when Quoting Editions: T: Text; Tr: Translation; C: Commentary; N: Notes

AAHG	*Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von der Österreichischen Humanistischen Gesellschaft.* Innsbruck.
AAntHung	*Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae.* Budapest.
AAPal	*Atti dell'Accademia di Scienze, Lettere e Arti di Palermo. Palermo.*
AAPat	*Atti e Memorie dell'Accademia Patavina di Scienze, Lettre ed Arti, Classe di Scienze morali, Lettre di Arti.* Padova.
AAWM	*Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz. Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse.* Wiesbaden.
AC	*L'Antiquité Classique.* Louvain.
ACD	*Acta classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniesis.* Debrecen.
AClass	*Acta classica. Proceedings of the Classical Association of South Africa.* Cape Town.
A&A	*Antike und Abendland. Beiträge zum Verständnis der Griechen und Römer und ihres Nachlebens.* Berlin.
Aevum	*Aevum. Rassegna di scienze storiche, linguistiche e filologiche.* Milano.
AJPh	*American Journal of Philology.* Baltimore.
AKG	*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte.* Köln.
ALGP	*Annali del Liceo G. Garibaldi di Palermo.* Palermo.
Altertum	*Das Altertum, herausgegeben vom Zentralinstitut für Alte Geschichte und Archäologie der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften.* Berlin.
Anregung	*Anregung. Zeitschrift für Gymnasialpädagogik.* München.
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung.* Berlin.
Antichthon	*Antichthon. Journal of the Australian Society for Classical Studies.* Sydney.
Antike	*Die Antike. Zeitschrift für Kunst und Kultur der Altertums.* Berlin.
Arcadia	*Arcadia. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft.* Berlin.
Arethusa	*Arethusa. A Journal of the Wellsprings of Western Man.* Buffalo, State University of New York.
Arion	*Arion. A Quarterly Journal of Classical Culture.* Boston University.
ARW	*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.* Berlin und Leipzig.
ASNP	*Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Lettere e Filosofia.* Pisa.
AU	*Der altsprachliche Unterricht. Arbeitshefte zu seiner wissenschaftlichen Begründung und praktischen Gestalt.* Stuttgart.

AUS	*Annales Universitatis Saraviensis. Phil.-Lettres.* Saarbrücken.
BAGB	*Bulletin de l'Association G. Budé.* Paris.
BICS	*Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London.* London.
BSTEC	*Bulletin de la Société toulousaine d'Études classiques.* Toulouse.
BStudLat	*Bollettino di Studi latini. Periodico quadrimestrale d'informazione bibliografica.* Napoli.
CB	*The Classical Bulletin.* Saint Louis.
CCC	*Civiltà classica e cristiana.* Genova.
C&M	*Classica et Mediaevalia. Revue danoise d'Histoire et de Philologie, publ. par la Société danoise pour les Études anciennes et médievales.* Copenhague.
CJ	*The Classical Journal.* Athens, University of Georgia.
CPh	*Classical Philology.* Chicago.
CQ	*Classical Quarterly.* Oxford.
CR	*Classical Review.* Oxford.
CRF	*Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta II. Comicorum Romanorum praeter Plautum et Terentium Fragmenta,* ed. O.Ribbeck (Leipzig, 2nd ed. 1873; repr. 1962; 3rd ed. 1898).
CW	*Classical World.* Pittsburgh, Pa.
Dessau	*Inscriptiones Latinae selectae,* vols. 1-3, ed. H.Dessau (Berolini, 1892-1916; repr. 1962).
DLZ	*Deutsche Literaturzeitung für Kritik der internationalen Wissenschaft.* Berlin.
Eirene	*Eirene. Studia Graeca et Latina.* Praha.
EL	*Études de Lettres. Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Lausanne et de la Société des Études des Lettres.* Lausanne.
Entretiens	*Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique. (Fondation Hardt).* Vandœuvres-Genève.
Eos	*Eos. Commentarii Societatis Philologae Polonorum.* Wrocław.
Eranos	*Eranos. Acta Philologica Suecana.* Uppsala.
FLP	E.Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993).
FPL	*Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum,* ed. W.Morel (Lipsiae, 2nd ed. 1927, repr. 1963); revised by K.Büchner (Lipsiae, 1982); replaced by J.Blänsdorf (Stuttgart, 1995) and by *FLP* (see above).
GB	*Grazer Beiträge. Zeitschrift für die klassische Altertumswissenschaft.* Graz.
G&R	*Greece and Rome.* Oxford.
GGA	*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen.* Göttingen.
Glotta	*Glotta. Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache.* Göttingen.
Gnomon	*Gnomon. Kritische Zeitschrift für die gesamte klassische Altertumswissenschaft.* München.
Gymnasium	*Gymnasium. Zeitschrift für Kultur der Antike und humanistische Bildung.* Heidelberg.
Helikon	*Helikon. Rivista di tradizione e cultura classica.* Rom.
Helmantica	*Helmantica. Revista de Filologia clásica y hebrea.* Salamanca.
Hermes	*Hermes. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie.* Wiesbaden.
Historia	*Historia. Revue d'histoire ancienne.* Wiesbaden.

HSPh	*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* Cambridge, Mass.
Humanistische Bildung	*Humanistische Bildung. Vorträge und Beiträge.* Stuttgart.
ICS	*Illinois Classical Studies.* Urbana, Illinois.
IF	*Indogermanische Forschungen.* Berlin.
JbAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum.* Münster.
JCS	*Journal of Classical Studies. The Journal of the Classical Society of Japan.* Kyoto.
JHI	*Journal of the History of Ideas.* Ephrata, Pennsylvania, & Philadelphia.
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies.* London.
KlP	*Der Kleine Pauly,* ed. by K. Ziegler and W. Sontheimer. München 1964-1975.
Lampas	*Lampas. Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse classici.* Muiderberg.
Latinitas	*Latinitas. Commentarii linguae latinae excolendae.* Città del Vaticano.
Latomus	*Latomus. Revue d'études latines.* Brüssel.
LCM	*Liverpool (later: Leeds) Classical Monthly.* Liverpool (later: Leeds).
LF	*Listy Filologické.* Praha.
Linguistica	*Linguistica.* Ljubljana.
Lustrum	*Lustrum. Internationale Forschungsberichte aus dem Bereich des klassischen Altertums.* Göttingen.
MAAR	*Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome.* New Haven, Yale Univ. Press.
Maia	*Maia. Rivista di letterature classiche.* Bologna.
MD	*Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici.* Pisa.
MDAI (R)	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Römische Abteilung).* Mainz.
Meander	*Meander. Revue de civilisation du monde antique.* Warszawa.
MH	*Museum Helveticum. Revue suisse pour l'Étude de l'Antiquité classique.* Basel.
MLatJb	*Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch.* Berlin.
Mnemosyne	*Mnemosyne. Bibliotheca Classica Batava.* Leiden.
MSLC	*Miscellanea di Studi di letteratura cristiana antica.* Catania.
NAWG	*Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Klasse.* Göttingen.
NGG	*Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil.-hist. Klasse.* Göttingen.
NP	*Neophilologus.* Groningen.
n.s.	new series, nova series, neue Folge, etc.
NTF	*Nordisk Tidsskrift for Filologi.* Copenhague.
PCPhS	*Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society.* Cambridge.
Philologus	*Philologus. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie.* Berlin.
Phoenix	*Phoenix. The Journal of the Classical Association of Canada.* Toronto.
PLLS	*Papers of the Liverpool (later: Leeds) Latin Seminar.* Liverpool (later: Leeds).
Poetica	*Poetica. Zeitschrift für Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft.* Amsterdam.

PP	*La Parola del Passato. Rivista di Studi antichi.* Napoli.
Prometheus	*Prometheus. Rivista quadrimestrale di studi classici.* Firenze.
PTL	*A Journal of Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature.* Amsterdam.
PVS	*Proceedings of the Virgil Society.* London.
RAIB	*Rendiconti dell'Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna. Classe di Scienze morali.* Bologna.
RCC	*Revue des Cours et des Conférences.* Paris.
RCCM	*Rivista di Cultura classica e medioevale.* Roma.
RE	*Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Stuttgart.
REA	*Revue des Études Anciennes.* Bordeaux.
REL	*Revue des Études Latines.* Paris.
RFIC	*Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione Classica.* Torino.
RhM	*Rheinisches Museum.* Frankfurt.
RIL	*Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo. Classe di Lettere, Scienze morali e storiche.* Milano.
RLAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum.* Stuttgart.
ROL	*Remains of Old Latin,* ed. and translated by E. H. Warmington, 4 vols. (London, 1936).
RPh	*Revue de Philologie.* Paris.
SAWW	*Sitzungsberichte der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Phil.-hist. Klasse.* Wien.
Semeiotica	*Semeiotica.* Amsterdam.
SIFC	*Studi italiani di Filologia classica.* Firenze.
SO	*Symbolae Osloenses.* Oslo.
Sokrates	*Sokrates.* Berlin.
Speculum	*Speculum. Journal of Medieval Studies.* Cambridge, Mass.
SSAL	*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Phil.-hist. Klasse.* Leipzig.
StudClas	*Studii Clasice.* Bucharest.
TAPhA	*Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association.* Cleveland, Ohio.
TR	*Le Temps de la réflexion.* Paris.
TRF	*Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta,* ed. O.Ribbeck (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1874, repr. 1962).
VChr	*Vigiliae Christianae. A Review of Early Christian Life and Language.* Amsterdam.
Vichiana	*Vichiana. Rassegna di Studi filologici e storici.* Napoli.
VMU	*Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta.* Moscow.
WJA	*Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft.* Würzburg.
WS	*Wiener Studien. Zeitschrift für Klassische Philologie und Patristik.* Wien.
WZHalle	*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg. Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe.* Halle.
YClS	*Yale Classical Studies.* New Haven.
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik.* Bonn.
ZRPh	*Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie.* Tübingen.

INDEX

by

GREGOR DAMSCHEN

I. INDEX LOCORUM

Albinovanus Pedo 1-23	209-215
Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica* 3. 1259-1262	63-73
Claudian, *De raptu Proserpinae* 1. 246-275	317-327
Corippus, *In laudem Iustini*, 2nd preface, 1-51	329-339
Cornelius Severus 1-25	217-225
Ennius, *Annales* 514-518	63-73
Homer, *Iliad* proem	76-90
Id., *Iliad* 6. 506-511 (= 15. 263-268)	63-73
Id., *Odyssey* proem	76-90
Livius Andronicus, *Odusia*	33-42
Naevius, *Bellum Poenicum*	45-58
Ovid, *Fasti* 4. 291-348	301-316
Id., *Metamorphoses* 1. 199-205	168-169
Id., *Metamorphoses* 1. 490-496	166-168
Id., *Metamorphoses* 1. 533-539	170-172
Id., *Metamorphoses* 1. 583-751	251-275
Id., *Metamorphoses* 4. 121-124	172-174
Id., *Metamorphoses* 6. 1-25	153-165
Id., *Metamorphoses* 6. 514-518	169-170
Id., *Metamorphoses* 13. 623-674	197-207
Silius Italicus, *Punica* 17. 1-47	301-316
Statius, *Achilleid* 1. 242-396	277-290
Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* 4. 344-422	251-275
Virgil, *Aeneid* 1. 1-33	75-90
Id., *Aeneid* 2. 250-297	90-98
Id., *Aeneid* 6. 450-476	123-129
Id., *Aeneid* 6. 679-899	99-122
Id., *Aeneid* 11. 492-497	63-73

II. INDEX NOMINUM

Names of authors and characters from history are contained in this index. Names of modern scholars, characters from literary texts, religion, and mythology were omitted. The most important pages are printed in italics.

Aemilius Macer 144
Aemilius Paullus 113
Aeschylus 46
Æsop 331
Albinovanus Pedo *209-215*; v; viii; 27
Alexander 6; 110; 232
Ambrose 143
Anastasius 331-332
Antony 27; 221-225
Apollonius of Rhodes 2; 7; 26; 50; 52; 57; 65; 70-71; 131; 133; 169; 186; 242; 261
Archytas the mathematician 41
Aristotle v; 22; 24; 50; 120-122
Augustine 143; 178
Augustus 82; 110-111; 113; 118; 168-169; 179; 182-184; 194; 200; 214; 224; 231; 339

Caesar 110; 112; 117; 168; 179; 182; 185; 190-196; 199; 229-232; 234; 238-240; 243-244; 246; 297
Caesius Bassus 59
Callimachus 127; 129; 144; 195; 305; 325
Camillus 119
Catiline 219
Cato (the Elder) 5; 26; 113; 231; 239
Catullus 10; 18; 48; 50; 127; 129; 147; 159; 164; 179; 195
Choerilus of Samos 51
Cicero 26; 29; 47; 54; 58; 60; 97; 114; 131; 173; 218-225; 234; 250; 274; 292; 294
Claudian *317-327*; vi; viii; 9; 20-22; 26-27; 31
Corippus *329-339*; vi; viii; 9; 19; 27
Cornelius Severus *217-225*; v; viii; 213
Cornutus 292
Ctesias 52

Domitian 9; 299
Domitius 232
Donatus 59; 76

Ennius *63-73*; v; vii; 2; 4-7; 9-10; 14; 18; 23; 26; 34; 42; 45; 50; 57-61; 81-83; 90; 94; 147; 153; 227; 233-236; 249; 293-294; 316
Epictetus 292
Epicurus 16
Euripides 115; 164

Fabius Pictor 51-52
Fabius Cunctator 113; 294; 296-298
Festus 59
Flaminius 315
Florus 250

Gellius 59
Germanicus 214
Gracchus 315

Hamilcar 50
Hannibal 19; 31; 234; 293-297; 300; 315
Hellanicus 52
Herodotus 52; 137
Hesiod 51; 57; 264
Homer vii; 5-7; 10; 14-15; 18; 26; 28; 31; 38-40; 52; 57; 61; 64; 66-72; 76-77; 80-81; 83-85; 87-88; 90; 96; 114-115; 119; 126; 128; 130-133; 136; 139-141; 151; 167; 169; 171-172; 174-177; 227; 229-235; 239; 241; 248; 250; 285; 293; 295; 312; 315; 338
Horace 3; 7-8; 26; 81; 116; 144; 284

Justin 334-339
Justinian 334-335; 337
Juvenal 9; 221

Lactantius 334
Leonidas the epigrammatist 41
Livius Andronicus *33-44*; v; vii; 3-4; 24; 45; 52-56; 58; 63; 83; 85
Livy 116; 164; 234; 291; 293-295; 299; 310

Lucan *227-250*; v; viii; 8-10; 21-22; 26; 30; 61; 215; 223; 275; 295; 297; 299; 315; 334
Lucilius 56; 234
Lucretius 8; 16; 57; 63; 214-215; 222; 244; 248;
249

Macrobius 59; 76
Manilius 8; 239; 244
Marcellus 113-115; 117; 296-297
Menander 164
Minucius 298
Moschus 50
Myron 54; 58-59
Mummius 113

Naevius *45-61*; v; vii; ix; 4; 7; 9-10; 42; 63; 82-83; 85; 250
Narses 336
Nero 8; 238; 291; 295
Nonius 59

Octavian 7
Octavius Lampadio 50; 58
Ovid *143-207*; v; viii; ix; 7-8; 10-12; 14; 17; 21; 26-30; 214; 223-224; 227; 239; 243-246; 248-250; 260-270; 272-275; 286-287; 294-295; 299-300; 305-316; 322-327; 331; 334; 339

Paullus 297-298; 315
Petronius 227
Philinus 51
Pindar 114
Plautus 45; 63; 180
Plato 158-159; 173
Polybius 47; 53
Pompey 112; 117; 232; 238-239; 243-244
Priscian 59
Probus 59
Prodicus 297
Propertius 7; 116; 144
Pyrrhus of Epirus 46
Pythagoras 179; 183; 190

Quintilian 228

Regulus 296

Sallust 63; 275
Scaeva 234; 241; 243; 246
Scipio 45; 293-295; 297-298; 300; 310; 314-315
Seneca the Elder 8; 22; 26; 28; 144; 147; 213; 240
Seneca the Younger 22; 244
Sempronius 113
Serranus 296
Silius Italicus *291-316*; vi; viii; ix; 18-19; 30; 247
Statius *277-290*; vi; viii; 15; 17-18; 20-21; 25-27; 31; 231; 315; 325-327
Stilicho 9

Tacitus 26; 28; 210; 250; 274-275
Terence 10
Thucydides 52; 275
Theocritus 272
Tiberius 8; 214
Tibullus 179; 191-192; 195-196
Timaeus of Tauromenium 51

Valerius Flaccus *251-275*; vi; viii; 19-20; 26; 28; 214; 316
Varro 46; 59; 178-179
Varro Atacinus 147
Verrius Flaccus 59
Virgil *75-141*; v; vii; viii; 6-11; 14-15; 18-20; 23-24; 26-31; 42; 45; 52; 57-61; 64-65; 68-72; 151; 171-176; 179; 183; 185; 191-192; 196; 223; 227; 230-234; 236-244; 247-250; 265; 267-268; 274; 285-286; 290; 292-294; 297; 299-300; 314; 316; 320-323; 332-335; 337-339
Vitellius 291

III. INDEX RERUM

The most important pages are printed in italics.

action
- types of 121-122

aemulatio s. *imitatio*
allegorical figures 195
alliteration 312-313
allusion 11; 220; 238-239; 241; 267; 283; 287; 294; 321; 339
- intertextual 215

amplificatio 224
aphorism 250; 275
aptum 26
argumentatio 30
ars *21-22*
audience 3-4; 6; 8-10; 81; 88
- Roman 5-6

breuitas *27-28*; 52; 54; 275
brevity 264; 275; 311; 314

catalogue *99-119*
change
- exchange of the narrative and comparative spheres 130; 133
- of roles 124-125
- of speed 147-148

chaos 215
chronology
- reverse 126

clash
- between two antagonistic realms 215
- of codes 225
- of contexts 171-172
- of cultures *63-73*
- of genres *177-196*
- of myth and history *45-61*
- of systems of values 197-208

code
- clash of 225
- codes of behaviour 224-225

context
- social

cosmology 249-250; 339
cosmos 215
cultures s. clash

defamiliarization *209-215*; 245; 247; 327
digressio *30-31*
dispositio *24-25*; *45-61*; *123-128*; 126-127
distance 173-174
drama 45-46; 89
- form and style 48

ecphrasis 157-158
elegy *301-316*
- interplay between epic and 305

elocutio *25-27*; *63-74*; *129-133*; *134-142*; *166-177*; *209-215*; *251-275*; 224; 327
- and defamiliarization *251-276*

epic *301-316*; 213; 217; 246; 248; 290; 332
- definition 228-229
- from elegy to *301-316*
- Hellenistic 51
- imagery *329-339*; viii
- interplay between elegy and 305
- Latin viii; 3; 8-10; 22-23; 28; 30-34; 36; 38; 42; 44; 53; 60; 85
- mythical viii; 55
- overlapping of "epic" and "elegiac" elements 127; 129; 191-192; 195-196
- personal comment of the author 243; 247; 250
- poets and readers *1-31*; 75-89
- revival *227-250*
- Roman vii-viii; x; 2-3; 6; 22; 40; 42
- Roman epic as schoolbook 2
- Roman epic and Roman identity 2
- technique 230; 235; 247
- tradition 153; 215; 227-228; 235; 240-241; 247; 249-250; 284; 290; 324; 336; 338
- transformation of epic imagery *329-340*

epilogue 165; 204

epithet 6
euidentia (*enargeia*) *27*; 176; 289-290; 327
excursus 29; 50-52
exercitatio *21-22*

foreshadowing 11
freedom of will 300

generic composition 17
genre vii-viii; 7; 20-21; 52; 89; 227; 242; 249-250; 294; 312; 339
- artificial differences of style 7
- clash of genres *196*; 21; 177; 290
- clashes and inclusions 21
- expectations of the public 7
genus
- *grande* *28*
- *medium* *28*
- *subtile* *28*
gradatio 215
gradation 211; 269; 286; 308

identity
- Roman viii; 43
- Graeco-Roman 275
imagery
- epic *329-339*
imitatio *15-17*; *227*; 21-22; 76; 241; 247; 294; 300
inclusion 21
influence 14; 233-235; 244; 298; 324
- Greek 230
- of sources 227
- of the public on literature *3-9*
- Roman 230
intertextuality *13-21*; *291-300*; *317-327*; ix; 2; 13-14; 17; 20; 26-28; 38; 60; 76; 90; 98; 215; 229; 250; 275; 290; 339; s. also clash
- and rhetoric *1-32*
- as guiding principle *291-300*
- as a part of a poetic "language" *13-21*
- as a principle of invention ix
- and poetic rhetoric *317-328*
- degrees of expliciteness 17-18
- problem of vii
- relationship 2; 16-17; 19; 90; 119
- rhetoric as a device of *21-32*
- tradition 21
"intertextuality" *13-21*; 21; 32; 43; 72; 250; 316; s. also clash
- between different cultural systems 21
- "intertextual" relations 20
inuentio *23-24*; *33-44*; *99-119*; *120-122*; *143-152*; 98; 126-127
invention *291-300*; 3; 40; 214; 222; 224; 245; 247; 289-290; 324
- of printing 1
inversion 123-129

Latinitas 25
levels
- abstract 215
- cultural and intellectual level of Roman audience 6
- of meaning 11
- of reading 14
literature 3-4; 7; 43; 93; 116
- Hellenistic 2; 38
- Latin 2-4; 7; 73
- Roman 2; 4; 36; 41; 73

memoria *28*; 32
metre 66; 70
- dactyls 211-213; 223
- hexameter 5; 33; 35; 42
- interplay between sentence structure and 224
- Saturnian 3; 33-34; 52-53
- spondees 211-213; 222; 314

narratio *29-30*; *90-98*
narrative
- "elegiac" and Callimachean 305-310
- "epic" 310-316
natura *21-22*

orality
- acustic performance 2
- forms of contact between author and reader
oratory *217-225*; 31; 275; 292

palpable presence
- of geographical reality 316
- of historical persons and facts 316
partes orationis *28-31*
participle
- predicative 313
- present *251-275*; 54; 93
- verbal function of 313
patronage

- of the emperor 8
- literary 4-6
peripeteia 120; 171
- coincidence of recollection and 121
peroratio *31*
perspicuitas 25
philosophy
- enlightenment vii; 43
- natural 8; 21; 215; 244
- of history 300
- philosophical background 31
- Pythagoreanism 8
- system 107
poetry 213; 224; 227-229; 232; 244; 249; 274; 287; 292; 307; 312; 319; 339; s. also epic and poets
- immortalizing power of 230
- intrusion of rhetoric into 224
- Latin 2; 5; 40; 53
- poetic invention ix
- relations 217
- survival of *217-226*
- tradition 213
poets vii; 7; 11; 19; 41; 53; 58; 66; 71; 77-83; 85; 107-108; 112; 117-118; 210; 214; 235; 242; 244
- and readers 143-153; 231; 205
- elegiac 7
- Latin epic poets 1
- Roman 2-3; 39
prooemium *28*; *75-89*; *153-165*; 57; 79-80; 90
psychological process 289-290
public 231
- explicitly addressed 7
- influence on literature *3-9*
- its reactions reflected in literature 10
- Roman 1; 38; 59

quotation *18*; 6; 127; 146-147; 237; 294; 316

reader
- appeal to the reader's literary experience 146-147
- as accomplice 146-147; 152
- communication between poet and 145-153; 205
- guidance given to the 147-152; 162-163; 167-168
- women as readers 2-3

reading
- as communicative act 144
- habits 143-145
- silent 143
realism 173; 196
reality
- geographical 316
- of history 232; 236; 250
- second 289
realm
- of nature 246
- of the universe 318
religion
- literary aspects of Gods 179-180
- Roman aspects 180-183
rhetoric 213-215; 217; 221-222; 224; 235-236; 242-243; 247-248; 250; 275; 283; 287; 292; 316
- as a device of intertextuality *21-32*
- futility of *277-290*; 327
- intrusion of poetry into 224
- its techniques vii; 10; 26
- of poetry 146
- of silence 28; 123; 127-128
- panegyric 331
- poetic *317-327*
- rhetorical syncrisis 225
Roman epic s. epic
Roman identity s. identity
Roman history s. Rome
Roman law 6; 21; 56
Roman public s. public
Roman religion 39; 56-57
Rome 1; 3-5; 7; 45-48; 50-51; 58-59; 63; 82; 84-86; 88-89; 94; 111; 118; 230; 294-295; 297; 305; 315
- as centre of the world 9
- epic on the birth of vii
- its mission 83
- Roman history vii; 46; 60; 87; 107; 116; 119
- tradition 3

silence s. rhetoric
simile *129-133*; 12; 16; 20; 26; 63; 65-71; 110; 124; 156; 232; 238-240; 243; 246-247; 268; 286; 289-290; 294; 296; 307; 320-323; 325; 332-339
- device of poetique technique 174-176
- from technology 173-174
- functions of 155-171
- tool of knowledge 174-176
social context 3

speech
- affective 250
speed 275
strength 224
style s. also epic
- "background" 300
- epic 30; 36-37; 52; 57
- exploitation of contrast and variation 224
- staccato 308
subjectivity 205
symmetry 313
syntax 264; 274; 313
- textual ix-x; 53; 56; 68; 71; 204
system 215; 290
- conflicting systems 224

tenses
- background 286
- change of 156; 307
- free choice of 137
- historic perfect 286; 308; 312-313
- present 286; 312-313
- switching of 136
- use of *134-141*; 200-203
textual criticism 152-153
textual syntax s. syntax
theology
- mythical 215
- solar 8
- theological terms 215
tragedy
- Roman 4
- tragic hero 121-122
- tragic irony 151

uelocitas 275
uirtutes dicendi 25
visual suggestiveness 287; 289
visualization
- vivid 290

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY J. M. BREMER, L. F. JANSSEN, H. PINKSTER
H. W. PLEKET, C. J. RUIJGH AND P. H. SCHRIJVERS

Recent volumes in the series:

141. CAMPBELL, M. *A Commentary on Apollonius Rhodius* Argonautica III 1-471. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10158 6
142. DEFOREST, M.M. *Apollonius'* Argonautica: *A Callimachean Epic.* 1994. ISBN 90 04 10017 2
143. WATSON, P.A. *Ancient Stepmothers.* Myth, Misogyny and Reality. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10176 4
144. SULLIVAN, S.D. *Psychological and Ethical Ideas.* What Early Greeks Say. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10185 3
145. CARGILL, J. *Athenian Settlements of the Fourth Century B.C.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 09991 3
146. PANAYOTAKIS, C. *Theatrum Arbitri.* Theatrical Elements in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10229 9
147. GARRISON, E.P. *Groaning Tears.* Ethical and Dramatic Aspects of Suicide in Greek Tragedy. 1995. 90 04 10241 8
148. OLSON, S.D. *Blood and Iron.* Stories and Storytelling in Homer's *Odyssey.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10251 5
149. VINOGRADOV, J.G.& S.D. KRYŽICKIJ (eds.). *Olbia.* Eine altgriechische Stadt im Nordwestlichen Schwarzmeerraum. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09677 9
150. MAURER, K. *Interpolation in Thucydides.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10300 7
151. HORSFALL, N. (ed.) *A Companion to the Study of Virgil.* 1995 ISBN 90 04 09559 4
152. KNIGHT, V.H. *The Renewal of Epic.* Responses to Homer in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10386 4
153. LUSCHNIG, C.A.E. *The Gorgon's Severed Head.* Studies of *Alcestis*, *Electra*, and *Phoenissae.* 1995. ISBN 90 04 10382 1
154. NAVARRO ANTOLÍN, F. (ed.). *Lygdamus.* Corpus Tibullianum III. 1-6: Lygdami elegiarum liber. Translated by J.J. Zoltowski. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10210 8
155. MATTHEWS, V.J. *Antimachus of Colophon.* Text and Commentary. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10468 2
156. TREISTER, M.Y. *The Role of Metals in Ancient Greek History.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10473 9
157. WORTHINGTON, I. (ed.). *Voice into Text.* Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10431 3
158. WIJSMAN, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus,* Argonautica, *Book V.* A Commentary. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10506 9
159. SCHMELING, G. (ed.). *The Novel in the Ancient World.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 09630 2
160. SICKING, C.M.J. & P. STORK. *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10460 7
161. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea Altera.* 1996. ISBN 90 04 10624 3
162. GERA, D. *Warrior Women.* The Anonymous Tractatus *De Mulieribus.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10665 0
163. MORRIS, I. & B. POWELL (eds.). *A New Companion to Homer.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 09989 1

164. ORLIN, E.M. *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10708 8
165. ALBRECHT, M. VON. *A History of Roman Literature.* From Livius Andronicus to Boethius with Special Regard to Its Influence on World Literature. 2 Vols. Revised by G. Schmeling and by the Author. Vol. 1: Translated with the Assistance of F. and K. Newman, Vol. 2: Translated with the Assitance of R.R. Caston and F.R. Schwartz. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10709 6 (Vol. 1), ISBN 90 04 10711 8 (Vol. 2), ISBN 90 04 10712 6 (Set)
166. DIJK, J.G.M. VAN. Αἶνοι, Λόγοι, Μῦθοι. Fables in Contexts in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10747 9
167. MAEHLER, H. (Hrsg.). *Die Lieder des Bakchylides.* Zweiter Teil: Die Dithyramben und Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10671 5
168. DILTS, M. & G.A. KENNEDY (eds.). *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire.* Introduction, Text, and Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10728 2
169. GÜNTHER, H.-C. *Quaestiones Propertianae.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10793 2
170. HEINZE, T. (Hrsg.). *P. Ovidius Naso. Der* XII. *Heroidenbrief: Medea an Jason.* Einleitung, Text und Kommentar. Mit einer Beilage: Die Fragmente der Tragödie *Medea.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10800 9
171. BAKKER, E.J. (ed.). *Grammar as Interpretation.* Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10730 4
172. GRAINGER, J.D. *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 10799 1
173. GERBER, D.E. (ed.). *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets.* 1997. ISBN 90 04 09944 1
174. SANDY, G. *The Greek World of Apuleius.* Apuleius and the Second Sophistic. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10821 1
175. ROSSUM-STEENBEEK, M. VAN. *Greek Readers' Digests?* Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10953 6
176. McMAHON, J.M. *Paralysin Cave.* Impotence, Perception, and Text in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10825 4
177. ISAAC, B. *The Near East under Roman Rule.* Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10736 3
178. KEEN, A.G. *Dynastic Lycia.* A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 B.C. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10956 0
179. GEORGIADOU, A. & D.H.J. LARMOUR. *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* True Histories. Interpretation and Commentary. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10667 7
180. GÜNTHER, H.-C. *Ein neuer metrischer Traktat und das Studium der pindarischen Metrik in der Philologie der Paläologenzeit.* 1998. ISBN 90 04 11008 9
181. HUNT, T.J. *A Textual History of Cicero's* Academici Libri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10970 6
182. HAMEL, D. *Athenian Generals.* Military Authority in the Classical Period. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10900 5
183. WHITBY, M. (ed.). *The Propaganda of Power.* The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10571 9
184. SCHRIER, O.J. *The* Poetics *of Aristotle and the* Tractatus Coislinianus. A Bibliography from about 900 till 1996. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11132 8
185. SICKING, C.M.J. *Distant Companions.* Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11054 2
187. BILLERBECK M. (Hrsg.). *Seneca.* Hercules Furens. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11245 6
188. MACKAY, E.A. (ed.). *Signs of Orality.* The Oral Tradition and Its Influence in the Greek and Roman World. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11273 1
189. ALBRECHT, M. VON. *Roman Epic.* An Interpretative Introduction. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11292 8